



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2010

No. 38

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WATSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 16, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANE E. WATSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

RESTORING AMERICANS' NET WORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, last week I brought the same chart to the House floor to visibly demonstrate how, starting in 2007, the Great Recession destroyed \$17.5 trillion of household aggregate wealth in the United States. I noted that it represented a loss of more than \$56,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. Trillions of dollars of home equity were lost, retirement savings and college funds lost.

As you can see by the red line here, the worst recession since World War II continually destroyed value from American households for seven straight quarters, from June of 2007 until March of 2009; 21 months of lost net worth. The economy was on the brink of collapse, and the tremendous losses to every American household were directly evident.

But this Congress acted. And as you can see from the blue line, since passage of the Recovery Act, Americans recovered \$5 trillion in net worth during the second and third quarters of 2009. Today I have even better news. Last week, data came out for the fourth quarter of 2009, and once again Americans' net worth increased for the third straight quarter. There was an additional \$800 billion returned to American households over just the past 3 months.

Let me put this in context. The Recovery Act was an investment in this Nation, in this economy, in the American people, to help bring us out of the Great Recession. It kept hundreds of thousands of teachers from being laid off, including 800 in my own district. That is not just a short-term investment in economic recovery, it is a long-term investment in our communities and in the education of our children.

The Recovery Act also provided for thousands of needed transportation improvements. Again, that is a short-term investment in construction jobs, but a long-term investment in our communities and national infrastructure. The Recovery Act's investments, including more than \$200 billion in tax cuts, totaled \$787 billion, and it will be spent over 2 years time. Where is the return on that investment, you just have to look at the blue line showing \$5 trillion in net worth that has been recovered since we passed that bill for American families in the first 9 months of this year. We can now add another

\$800 billion to that figure for the last 3 months of 2009, nearly \$6 trillion in recovered wealth.

The recovery of America's net worth is vital to the overall recovery of our economy. Consumer spending makes up 70 percent of our GDP. However, so long as consumers' net worth remains depressed, consumer spending will naturally suffer. When consumer spending suffers, businesses pull back and lay off employees. It is a tragic downward spiral, one that unfolded starting in the Bush administration in 2007.

But this chart, this blue line of recovery shows we are back on the right track. Despite historic blizzards that many thought would imperil the recovery, retail sales actually increased 0.3 percent in February, outpacing expectations. Housing prices increased 7 straight months, reversing 22 straight months of decline. New orders for manufactured goods are at their highest level since 2008. The manufacturing index has been growing for 6 straight months, and manufacturing jobs have been growing for 3 months. GDP grew at 5.9 percent, its fastest growth in 6 years, in the fourth quarter of 2009. And today, the stock market is up more than 70 percent since its March of 2009 low.

We are not out of the woods yet, and we have some ground to cover before the value of the economic losses are fully recovered. But we are making steady progress, as we can see from this chart. We must now continue on that path to restore financial stability for our residents and the economy as a whole.

JOB KILLING HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, this week we are going to be taking up, we

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1443

think, a job killing so-called health care reform bill that the American people do not want but that the Democratic leadership and the President are determined to cram down our throats.

This bill will not help our situation in terms of health care or health insurance. It does not reduce the cost of health insurance which was one of the goals the President said that he wanted. It does not solve any of the problems that we need to solve in health care. In fact, it makes those problems worse.

Yesterday I had a town hall in Statesville, North Carolina, with about 175 people there. They are very upset about this proposed health care reform bill. They understand that a lot of dirty tricks are being played here, and they don't like it. They don't like several aspects of the proposal that is being brought forth this week.

Number one, they don't like the fact that the Democrats are proposing to pass this bill without voting on the bill. They know that goes from passing bills without reading them to passing bills without voting for them. Another thing that they don't like is they don't like to see two bills that have no relationship to each other put together because one of the bills can't pass on its own and so the folks in charge attach it to a bill that they can get the votes for.

And so what the majority people are doing is they are going to latch onto their reconciliation bill a job-killing government takeover of student loans. They are attaching that to their job-killing government takeover of health care which many people have called a monstrosity.

This is not the way the American people want us to be operating in this Congress. We are the greatest country in the world with the best form of government in the world. But what is about to happen this week, if the American people do not speak out even louder than they have spoken out, is you are going to see Democrats vote for this monstrosity and undermine the rule of law that exists in this country. It is a scary proposition.

Republicans know that we need reform in health insurance and in health care, and we have made proposals to do that. We have legislation that will reduce cost in health insurance. The plan that the Democrats have put forward will not reduce cost. Even one of their Senators, DICK DURBIN, said that last week on the floor of the Senate.

The bill also does not allow people to continue the current health insurance that they have which the President has been saying you could do. In his meeting with Republicans at our retreat, he admitted that he had been saying that incorrectly. He is still saying it even though he said it was incorrect because you will not be allowed to keep your insurance if you like it.

Republicans want for Americans to be able to buy their health care across State lines. We want medical liability

reform. We want to expand health savings accounts. We want to put Americans in charge of their health care and in charge of their health insurance. We don't want a giant government takeover of health insurance and health care. This can be done to help Americans, but what the Democrats are proposing will not be the right thing to do.

I serve on the Rules Committee. They are planning to bring a rule that will say if you vote for the rule, you voted for the bill. That has never happened in the history of this country. Again, it undermines the rule of law and the American people will not stand for it.

COLON CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind Members of this body that the month of March is Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month. During the month of March, colon cancer advocates across the country will organize and participate in a wide range of activities to raise awareness about this horrible disease. This year alone, almost 150,000 Americans will be diagnosed with colon cancer, and approximately 50,000 of them will die from it.

Madam Speaker, it doesn't have to be that way. If detected early, the survival rate for colon cancer is almost 90 percent. Yet less than half of all Americans get the recommended preventive tests by the suggested age of 50.

Colon cancer is an issue that is very personal to me; 12 years ago, I lost my mother Janna to this dreadful disease. And since arriving in Congress, I have made it one of my missions to bring attention to this serious yet preventable cancer. So for the next 3 weeks, I want Members of this body to ask themselves and their constituents two important questions: Have you asked your doctor if you should get a colonoscopy? Do you know that it could save your life?

THE FAIR TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, this past weekend, like many Americans, my wife and I sat at our kitchen table and worked on getting our taxes figured out so we could file our return. Across our country, millions of Americans are working to finalize their annual tax return. It is clear that our system of income taxes is broken. To restore our Nation's economic health, increase personal liberty, reduce cheating and confusion, and restore fairness, Congress must abandon our current tax code and replace it with something much better.

There is no reason that paying taxes should be so complicated and so con-

fusing. The burden in this process that is placed upon individuals and small businesses must be relieved. The IRS itself has estimated that 7.6 billion hours are spent in tax preparation every year. That 7.6 billion hours equates to 3.8 million people working full time for a full year. Congress can simplify this process and reduce the amount of time and energy spent on paying our taxes.

As a longtime supporter of the FAIR Tax, I see H.R. 25 as a step in the direction of liberty and prosperity. The FAIR Tax seeks to eliminate the payroll, estate, and many other taxes to be replaced by a national sales tax levied on purchased goods. Overhauling the U.S. Tax Code is not an easy task to undertake, but reducing the burden of filing taxes should be a priority in this Congress. Anyone who views our tax collection practices can see the flaws. The question is whether Congress has the courage and determination to change it.

The process of tax reform has major consequences for every American, but it is a process that must be started because the consequences of inaction are too costly. The truth remains that Americans want and need some sort of tax filing relief. The need for common-sense reform becomes more obvious during this tax season.

I have called on the newly installed chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) to schedule a hearing on the FAIR Tax. I encourage my colleagues who are serious about starting an open conversation on tax reform to join me in this request. The American people are ready to have that conversation, and their representatives should be also.

□ 1145

Americans are in need of tax reform and simplification, but instead, all they are getting from this Congress is increased spending and record deficits. By reforming this broken process, Americans will once more be in charge of their lives and their money.

Over the course of the last several years, American taxpayers have become much more attentive to what is and what is not happening in Washington, DC. Tea Party protests and fair tax advocates are making their voices heard. Their message is clear to Congress if Congress will only listen—simplify the tax code. In doing so, we will create an opportunity for economic growth and new prosperity while increasing personal freedom and liberty.

April 15 is now less than 1 month away. No more business as usual. Let's not let another tax year go by without action to replace our convoluted, confusing, and freedom-restricting tax code.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALZ. Madam Speaker, this week this House has a historic opportunity. For far too long, millions of Americans have not been able to afford basic health care coverage. For far too long, families with insurance are told when they finally need to use that insurance, that they are not covered. For too long, insurance company executives and bureaucrats have dictated what is covered to the doctors.

For far too long, those who are insured have been paying a hidden tax to cover the millions of uninsured. This week the figure is \$51 million. For far too long, the United States has spent double the amount of any other industrialized nation, and we are no healthier for it. And for far too long, there have been those who have said we can wait a little longer; we will put health care off and do it at another time.

This button was given to me last weekend by a woman in Fountain, Minnesota. It reads, "Healthcare for All—the time is now." She's been carrying it for 25 years.

Last week, the Mayo Clinic—which is in my district in southern Minnesota—along with the Cleveland Clinic and other leading institutions, put out a statement urging reform in this House. The statement read, "Reforming health care in America will not become easier with the passage of time," and we urge you to move forward.

The time is right for America to fix this inequity. The time is right to move America forward, and as the button says, health care for all, the time is now. That is this week.

FLORIDIANS ARE HARD AT WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, March 15, was Florida's Day of Action to raise awareness about the sham elections in Sudan which are scheduled for next month. When the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed in the year 2005, the dream of a united Sudan, where everyone—regardless of gender, ethnicity, or religion—lived in freedom, it seemed possible. Elections were intended to usher that change.

Unfortunately, the Sudanese Government has since proven that it will do anything to remain in power—including slaughtering civilians and stealing elections. Southern parties have committed abuses, but it is Sudan's tyrant—an indicted war criminal—who remains the greatest obstacle to peace.

The time for wishful thinking is over. These elections are a sham, hijacked to legitimize the rule of a reprehensible, murderous regime. Responsible nations must work to ensure Sudan's butcher answers for his crimes before this process moves forward.

So congratulations to the many Floridians who spearheaded the Day of Action yesterday.

And speaking of Floridians, our State is hurting. Our economy is in serious trouble. Floridians ask what is the best way to put Floridians back to work without increasing our mounting national debt. The latest national unemployment record shows that we're still facing an almost 10-percent unemployment statistic. And totally unacceptable is Florida's numbers. Florida's number, 11.8 percent unemployment rate in my home State of Florida.

How can we fix this problem? Part of it deals with what U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk, said, and it was an important and very timely message. He said, Trade supports millions of U.S. jobs and expanding trade must be part of the U.S. economy. Congress needs to support long-delayed trade pacts with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, which will greatly expand access to overseas markets for Florida businesses.

While these agreements are stalling here in Washington, our competitors are cutting their own deals to open more markets for their exporters. The European Union, for example, has concluded an agreement with South Korea—similar to the one that has been languishing here in Washington, DC.

Hundreds of thousands of people are employed in the trade industry. In my home State of Florida, we exported more than \$47 billion in goods last year. South Florida is the gateway to Latin America, and it's a huge hub for trade with Colombia, which has already produced thousands of jobs in key industries, such as the flower-importing industry. Trade is a crucial part of our economic recovery and an ideal opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to work together on an important issue.

It's so important to my home State of Florida, which brings me to another national issue that is crucial to my State of Florida, and that is a complete and accurate census count. We must mobilize everyone to participate in the 2010 census and help increase funding for education, health care, transportation, and other key programs while ensuring that our area will get the programs it deserves.

Having represented a diverse area such as South Florida here in Congress, I know that we need to reach out to residents of low-income and minority neighborhoods, which are especially at risk of being undercounted in the 2010 census. Along with many other metropolitan areas, Miami-Dade County will have a bilingual, English and Spanish, census form, as well as a special census outreach effort to the Colombian, to the Haitian, to the Cuban communities, among many different ethnic groups in our community and in our Nation.

Accurate data reflecting changes in our diverse and ever-changing communities will decide how over \$400 billion per year is spent in Federal grants and how it's allocated for programs like new hospitals and schools.

So your assistance, South Florida, with a complete census count will help ensure that essential social service programs like job training, after-school programs, school lunch programs, senior citizen centers, they will receive the funding they deserve. So please help us kick off our efforts to get the most complete census count in history. Floridians, get on board.

And I am so proud of the many Floridians who do amazing things every day.

In my congressional district of South Florida, Madam Speaker, extraordinary groups such as Teens Against Domestic Abuse, otherwise known as T-A-D-A—TADA—are working to raise awareness about domestic abuse. And TADA is a local student activist group run by a caring and passionate young woman, Emily Martinez-Lanza.

So I thank the exemplary work of Floridians. From the Call of Action on Sudan, to the economy, to the census, to combating domestic abuse, Floridians are hard at work.

"PASSED" NOT "DEEMED"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, the American people don't want a government takeover of health care. I heard it at town hall meetings, across eastern Indiana this weekend, and at a rally at the Statehouse in Indianapolis yesterday where over a thousand gathered on short notice.

Now, I know many in the Democratic leadership and the administration don't like us to call it a "government takeover of health care," but when you mandate that every American purchase health insurance—whether they want it or need it or not—you mandate what's in that insurance. If you set up a government-run insurance exchange to control what kind of insurance people can buy and set up a massive bureaucracy, even a new health care czar to govern all of it, that sure looks like to me a government takeover of health care. And the American people know it.

Now, clear majorities of this country have rejected this approach. But nevertheless, as we read in the papers, Congress is intent this week on bringing this legislation—seemingly by any means—to the floor of the House of Representatives. And I want to speak about those means today.

The choice that the leadership of the Congress has before them is whether or not to bring the wildly discredited Senate bill to the floor of the House of Representatives. But the truth is, the bill, with its Cornhusker Kickback, with the public funding of abortion, simply couldn't pass the House floor. There's just not the votes for it.

But it seems at this moment what we hear is that the Democratic leadership here in Congress is so desperate to pass this government takeover of health care that they are willing to twist the

rules of the House and the Senate into a pretzel to get it done.

But I am not here to talk about the arcane rules of the Senate and reconciliation that the follow-on bill would be an abuse of. I'm not even here to talk about the rules of the House. I'm really here to talk about the Constitution of the United States of America.

I mean, this so-called Slaughter House Rule that is being proposed, the idea that the Senate bill could be deemed as passed on the House floor without Members of Congress being asked to vote for it, I believe not just tramples on the common sense and insults the intelligence of the American people, but it really tramples on the Constitution of the United States. Let me break it down for you.

I've understood this since the first time I saw "School House Rock" about how a bill becomes a law and that little bill danced up the House steps when I was a kid. Let me read it. It's in the Constitution, Article I, section 7, "Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a Law, be presented to the President of the United States." There it is.

As we learned as school children, as it says in the Constitution, a bill becomes a law after it has passed the House of Representatives—not after it was deemed to have passed, not after it was buried in a procedural motion that no one really has to say they have supported, but after it has passed on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Now, some will say that, well, Republicans just want to talk about process here; we're trying to do something for health care. Well, wait a minute. The processes that are in the Constitution of the United States exist to protect the liberty of the American people and hold those who govern them responsible. The reason our Founders enshrined in the Constitution of the United States the requirement that bills might not become law unless they pass on the House floor is so that they could hold accountable the decisions that the men and women who would serve in this Chamber throughout our history would make.

Madam Speaker, the very idea that the Senate bill could be adopted by the House without any vote on the floor is anathema to the Constitution of the United States, and I believe it's an insult to the American people.

I would say respectfully, Madam Speaker, if you have the votes, vote the Senate bill on the floor. Let's bring it down here. Let's have a good, long debate about that bill that passed the Senate on Christmas Eve with all of its backroom deals and all of its public funding for abortion and its individual mandates and its tax increases.

But if you don't have the votes, let's scrap the bill. Let's start over. Let's commit ourselves to building health care reform on the principles of limited government and free market econom-

ics. Let's pass health care reform that will lower the cost of health insurance rather than growing the size of government.

And for heaven's sake, whatever we do, let's go forward this week in a way that honors those who have gone before, those who have fought for this Constitution. Let us live up to the ideals of our Founders and the expectation of our people. And let's throw this Slaughter House Rule business in the trash heap where it belongs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

God Almighty and Father of us all, we praise You, the source of all we have and all we are. Teach us to acknowledge always the many good things Your infinite love has given us. Help us to love You in return with all our heart and all our strength.

Empower us to serve this Nation with such wisdom and compassion that Your own gracious goodness and love of humanity may be evident and give You glory both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHAUER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concur-

rent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution recognizing and congratulating the City of Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the new official site of the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Service and the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Anthem Blue Cross in my home State of California is trying to raise premiums by 39 percent. This is only the beginning if we do nothing. We must give the American people, not the insurance companies, more control. If we do nothing, the American people will continue to pay higher premiums and higher out-of-pocket costs now and in the future.

We cannot, our families cannot, afford to do nothing. Health reform will hold health insurance companies accountable; end discrimination based on preexisting conditions; cut and eventually close the doughnut hole for thousands of seniors, including 5,200 seniors in my district; cut the national deficit; and produce over 4 million new jobs in the coming decade. That is 400,000 new jobs every year.

Health care reform will bring coverage to 219,000 in my district and 31 million nationwide for the very first time in history. This is a historic moment. In 1935, we passed Social Security. In 1965, we passed Medicare. We must pass health reform now.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, the American people are appalled by what they have seen in this health care debate. But the worst is still ahead. The bill has already failed. The American people don't want it, and they are screaming at the top of their lungs, stop. But, yet, Congress continues to proceed.

The American people want jobs. But what does this bill do? It puts the American people out of work. They want lower health care costs, while the health care bill being debated is going to raise the cost of premiums. They want less government, yet this bill is going to create a giant bureaucracy here in Washington. They want to protect life. Yet the bill is going to force taxpayers to fund elective abortions.

If that weren't enough, the majority plans to force the toxic Senate bill through the House under some controversial trick. There is no way to hide from this vote. It will be the biggest vote that most Members ever cast. Now you can run, but you can't hide. Let's defeat this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SCHAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHAUER. Madam Speaker, health care is an issue of basic economics to middle class families, seniors and businesses. During the health care debate, my constituents have asked me to listen. I'm listening.

The story I heard last week is from a college in my area. It employs 300 people. As in the case with many employers, the lion's share of their costs come from employee costs, 70 percent in this college's case. Their health insurance premiums this year went up 17 percent. Seventeen percent. What does that mean? It means job cuts or tuition increases, or both, both disastrous for middle class families in our economy.

Seventeen percent premium increases. The Nation's five largest private health insurance companies' profits went up \$12 billion last year while they dropped 2.7 million people from coverage. Our current health care system may work for the health insurance industry, but it is broken for middle class families and is hurting our economies. It must be fixed now.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, Republicans have come to the floor today because we care about Americans' health care. We just don't care for this bill. But still, the majority seems committed to trying to muscle through a trillion-dollar overhaul that will change health care for every man, woman, and child.

Americans have made it very clear. They don't like this bill. They don't want the government in the decision-making of their health care. They want lower costs, and they don't want their government tax dollars going to fund abortion services.

So why can't we start over, Madam Speaker? We ask again. There has been a year and a half nearly of debate over this and still more questions than answers. That's why we are hearing reports that the majority will try to ram this through without a direct vote on the Senate bill, Madam Speaker. We should take an up-or-down vote on the Senate bill.

H.R. 4440, THE COMBAT ACT

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the sacrifices of American men and women serving our country overseas and to urge my colleagues to support legislation I introduced to give them a much-deserved pay increase for facing dangerous situations.

Late last year, I traveled to Afghanistan and was privileged to meet members of our Armed Forces serving our country in a difficult and dangerous environment. Two of those soldiers approached me and said they had not seen a combat pay increase in several years and asked me to do what I could do to make the burden of overseas deployment easier for them and their families.

As a result, when I got back to Washington, I introduced H.R. 4440, the COMBAT Act, which provides several types of combat pay increases, including hostile fire pay, imminent danger pay and family separation allowance. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting our troops and their families by becoming a cosponsor of this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. The Democrat health care bill that is being brought through the Congress this week is nothing more than a government takeover of health care, and the American people know it. I know the administration doesn't like us to use that phrase, but come on. When you mandate that every American purchase health insurance whether they want it or need it or not, you mandate that every business provide it, you create a massive government-run bureaucracy exchange that mandates what is in insurance plans, you wrap that all in about \$1 trillion worth of spending, that is a government takeover of health care.

But what is really remarkable about this whole business is that not only have the American people rejected this plan, but Democrats are so desperate to pass it that they are willing to trample on the traditional rules of the House and the Senate and even trample on the Constitution of the United States to get it done. The Constitution provides that a bill becomes a law if it has passed the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Democrats actually don't have the votes to pass the Senate bill, so they have decided they are going to try and pass the bill without a vote.

Well, that would be news to the Founders of this country and a betrayal of the commitment of every Member of this Congress to the American people. I urge the Speaker, if you have the votes for the Senate bill, bring it to the floor. If you don't, let's scrap the bill and start over for the American people.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, at least 46 million Americans are now un-

insured; 7.7 million in California are uninsured, and at least 80,000 are uninsured in the Sixth Congressional District, which is the district I represent. By the end of the day, 14,000 more Americans will lose their coverage, more than 2,000 of them in California.

Without health care reform, the average family premium in California will rise from \$13,280 to \$22,660 by the year 2019. That's why we must pass the health care reform bill that brings down costs and increases competition. The Senate bill, with the corrections, including better subsidies and insurance market reforms, will be the beginning of this.

We must pass health reform so that our Nation's families have access to affordable, quality health insurance.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, The Washington Post today on the front page said: Pelosi may try to pass health bill without a vote. May try to pass health bill without a vote. I didn't even think that was possible, but apparently The Washington Post and the Speaker of the House think it's possible. It's no wonder, Madam Speaker, that the country is outraged not just by the bill, but by the process. This was like the Speaker's statement that said we would have to pass the bill so we could know what's in it.

Madam Speaker, this bill does not reduce costs. It cuts Medicare and increases taxes for 10 years and spends the money in 6 years. Madam Speaker, this bill throws the health care system up in the air and just hopes that the greatest health care system in the world is still there when it lands a few years from now.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we have a vote on this bill, a debate on this bill and we do not pass this bill with a vote.

BORDER VIOLENCE

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, three people connected to the U.S. Consulate in Ciudad Juarez were brutally murdered by drug cartels in front of their young children.

What more must happen to focus our attention on the serious threat along 2,000 miles of our southern border? For the safety of Americans living in border States and traveling or working in Mexico, we must take this danger seriously and crack down on the cartels. U.S. citizens are increasingly at risk of being innocent victims of this brutal violence, but the administration budget would cut resources intended to crack down on cartels and to secure our border.

I call on the White House to provide necessary support for law enforcement, at all levels, to track down these criminals and their networks. This is a fight we cannot lose. It is too close to home. My thoughts and prayers are with the families of those who lost their lives in these attacks.

□ 1215

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, America needs health care reform, but America knows that this is not the right approach. This is the wrong policy and it is the wrong process; yet the majority is willing to do everything possible to pass this bill, even over the objections of the American people.

Just recently, CNN had a poll that showed 73 percent of Americans across the country would like to scrap the bill or start all over; yet now we are being told the Democrat leadership may deem the bill passed without Members of Congress even voting on it. That is un-American. It ignores the democratic process.

Madam Speaker, we need an up-or-down vote. If Congress passes this bill without even a vote on it, the American people will be outraged, and rightfully so. There is a better way. Let's go to work on it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Speaker, just when we thought we had heard enough, seen enough, and paid enough, the big insurance companies are at it again. Seniors are paying more for prescriptions, home values plummet, savings and retirement accounts disappear, and millions lose homes, jobs, and their health care. But that didn't stop the big health insurance companies from announcing premium increases of nearly 40 percent.

Look, Madam Speaker, these companies have some impudence. They have to be stopped. Deny, deny, deny. They deny coverage. They deny claims. They deny care. And last week the CEOs came to Washington. It is not enough that we have to dodge their lobbyists in the Halls of Congress, but they came to town, staying at the Ritz on your premium dollars, and now they want to deny the American people quality, affordable, and accessible health care.

They know we are in the home stretch, and they won't stop at anything. They will stop at nothing to keep us from clamping down on their practices. But we are going to stop them. Let's deny them. Let's vote them off the island. I am ready to do it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, words that strike fear in the heart of every American are, "I'm from the Federal Government, and I'm here to help you."

We have a bill here that people can't read; they are not given the opportunity to understand. We have smoke screens everywhere, backroom deals being made that nobody knows what they are, all from the Federal Government that is here to help you.

We are going to take over your health care, take over about one-sixth of the economy, and "We're from the Federal Government, and we're here to help you."

By the way, we are even going to push this through the House of Representatives without a vote, so you don't have to worry about whether your Representative stands up for your rights or not. Is this the kind of democracy we want?

This is a bad bill. Give us a straight vote, be straight with the American people, and let's let the American people know that that man who says "We're here to help you" is not going to get in their back pocket.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, we have been talking about health care reform for nearly a century, and certainly inaction is no longer acceptable. The American people voted for and demand reform. They deserve our support.

Health insurance reform is about cost. These reforms slow the growth of health care spending and make health care insurance more affordable for everyone while reducing our deficit.

Health insurance reform is about coverage. These reforms will cover nearly all Americans, including those with preexisting conditions, and will not drop you if you get sick.

Health insurance reform is about competition. It repeals antitrust exemptions for insurance companies and brings them into a regulated marketplace to bring down prices for families and small businesses.

Health insurance reform is about care. These reforms eliminate copays for yearly checkups and screenings and ensure that our seniors have access to prescription drugs that they can actually afford.

Health insurance reform returns control to mothers, to fathers, to grandparents, and families, where it belongs, not with insurance companies, not with government.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WALDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I was a small business owner with my wife for nearly 22 years and I served on a hospital board, and I support reforming the health care system. In fact, I have offered up legislation to do that and supported other bills, but the way that this process is being mismanaged and misrun today is not the way to do health care reform. There isn't the transparency the American people deserve and that is now being denied by those in charge.

We are reading in the press that the Senate bill, with all of its barnacles on it, may pass this House without ever having a stand-up "yes" or "no" vote. That is outrageous.

And what does that bill do and what do these bills do? They whack Medicare \$500 billion. Thirty-eight thousand seniors in my district run the risk of losing the Medicare Advantage policies that they have.

This is not the way to do health care reform. You should scrap the bill and start over on a bipartisan basis.

I had two amendments to deal with rural health care issues adopted unanimously in the Energy and Commerce Committee, both of which, after the committee passed the bill out of the committee itself, were stripped out somewhere between the committee and the House floor, and the Democrats wouldn't even let me offer those amendments on the House floor again.

Stop this process. Let's do it right.

STIMULUS AND ECONOMIC INDICATORS

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I continue to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle refer to the stimulus bill as a failed policy, apparently in the belief that if you say it over and over again it will be true. But it's not true, not by a long shot.

Last year at this time, the stock market was at 6,500 and today it is at 10,600. One year ago, during the first quarter of 2009, GDP came in at a staggering 6 percent decline, but in the last quarter of 2009 it rose almost 6 percent. And monthly job losses, while not where we want them to be, are literally 20 times better than they were a year ago today.

Some may say this would have happened anyway and that the stimulus had nothing to do with it, but I would ask my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to consider that would be quite a coincidence, don't you think, for all those economic indicators to begin such a dramatic turnaround at precisely the time the stimulus passed. Quite a coincidence indeed.

SUNSHINE WEEK

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, it was an interesting irony. When I woke up this morning, I heard on the radio that this week has been dubbed "Sunshine Week," meaning that there needs to be greater openness and transparency.

We all agree that we need to do everything that we can, as my Democratic colleagues have said, to increase competition and bring the cost of health insurance down. We all agree that that needs to be done. But, Madam Speaker, this measure will not accomplish that at all. We have commonsense solutions that I believe we can utilize and implement in a bipartisan way.

So here we are in the midst of Sunshine Week, and as my colleagues have been saying: What is it that is happening? We are seeing every effort made to try and avoid the kind of transparency, disclosure, and accountability that were promised in that document, "A New Direction for America," that then-Minority Leader PELOSI put forward.

Madam Speaker, I am convinced, I am convinced that we can do better. But we need to make sure that, as we proceed with this process, we have the kind of openness that the American people insist upon.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, every process must end. After dozens of hearings on health care, we have all of the information that we need to create strong legislation to provide much needed health insurance reform. The American people cannot wait. It is time to vote.

Rising health care costs are crushing families and businesses, forcing small business owners to choose between health care and jobs. This isn't about politics or poll numbers. This is about making good on the promise of providing every American access to high quality, affordable health care. This is about having the courage to do what is right.

By voting for health insurance reform now, we are supporting the millions of Americans who quietly struggle every day with a system that works better for the insurance companies than it does for them.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, to join us in helping the American people by voting for health insurance reform now.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BACHUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, the United States is the largest economy

in the world. We are bigger than our four next competitors, and we got there through personal freedom and individual choice. We didn't get there by government management.

Now, countries in Europe, we have heard a lot about the fact that they have government-run health care, but that is not America. We are distinct. We place our faith in the individual. We compete, but we don't compete with the government.

The Federal Government should not be given the power to make health care choices for you or your family or to force you, as a taxpayer, as a citizen, to pay for an abortion when it violates your values.

Let's listen to the majority of Americans. Let's start over. Let's have an American plan. Let's work on solutions that are consistent with our traditions of choice, freedom, and put our faith in the individual, not the government.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of finally passing health reform.

This bill is the product of countless hearings, hundreds of amendments, and a full year of national public debate. It is time to vote.

According to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, without reform, health care costs for American families will rise by as much as 79 percent in the next 10 years. That is unsustainable for taxpayers, for small businesses, for families.

The bill we will pass this week will take the necessary steps to rein in these costs. It creates incentives to reduce preventable hospital readmission; it eliminates wasteful overpayments to Medicare Advantage plans; and it increases our capabilities to fight fraud, waste, and abuse.

Passing health reform means lower costs for patients, better access to higher quality care, and, at long last, accountability for insurance companies.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, let's move our Nation forward by passing health reform this week.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, the American people are speaking, and I think we should listen even as the House leadership again prepares to force through a partisan government takeover of health care.

The bill includes hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes and more than \$1 trillion in new government spending.

Strong-arm tactics and legislative gimmicks should not be used to jam through a bill which will impact the life of every single American.

We need to focus on true reform which lowers health care costs, limits unnecessary lawsuits, and expands access by allowing purchasing across the State lines for health insurance, not simply a takeover which we already know will not control costs.

That is the type of reform Americans want, not this one-size-fits-all approach, putting bureaucrats between doctors and their patients.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. I had a remarkable American in my office this morning, Gary Hall, who won five golds, three silvers, and two bronzes in three Olympic Games in freestyle swimming, a remarkable person. And he told me a story about having insurance for 12 years while he was in the Olympics, but then after he lost the Olympics, he couldn't get insurance. Do you know why? He has diabetes.

Here is a guy who won gold, silver, and bronze medals and couldn't get insurance in America because he had diabetes. And the reason he couldn't get insurance in America is that we haven't passed our health care reform bill yet.

In the next few days, we are going to put up at least 216 votes, I hope, green lights on that board, to pass health care reform so that Gary Hall can get insurance; and even if you haven't won a gold medal, you can get insurance if you have diabetes. And these people who are smoking something, I don't know what, who think we aren't going to take a vote on this, I am going to take a picture of this board to show you the votes, because the green lights are going to be to make sure that people with diabetes can get insurance, and the red lights will be you can't get insurance even if you have won a gold medal. That is not right. It is going to change in this country.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. There are many problems with the Senate's government takeover of health care, problems with cuts to Medicare, problems with the Cornhusker kickback, problems with the massive job-killing taxes, problems with Federal funding of abortion, but the latest problem is that the majority doesn't have the votes to pass it.

Rather than finally listening to the American people's rejection of this misguided bill, the majority is planning to abuse the legislative process to

pass their government takeover without a single up-or-down vote.

As a mom, I would never allow my kids to deem their rooms clean; so it is disgraceful that the majority plans to deem their \$2.5 trillion government takeover of health care as passed without a vote as provided for in the Constitution.

I urge my colleagues to do the truly courageous thing and demand a clean vote.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the time is always right to do what is right, and that time is now. The spirit of history is upon us. We must pass health care.

There are those who have told us to wait. They have told us to be patient. We cannot wait. We cannot be patient. The American people need health care, and they need it now.

Will we stand with the American people or will we stand with the big insurance companies? We have a moral obligation to make health care a right and not a privilege.

We cannot wait a moment longer. We must pass health care, and we must pass it now.

□ 1230

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, today, The Washington Post bore a headline that should be of grave concern to all Americans: "House may try to pass Senate health care bill without voting on it." The Post article said, "After laying the groundwork for a decisive vote this week on the Senate's health care bill, House Speaker NANCY PELOSI suggested Monday that she might attempt to pass the measure without having Members vote on it."

Despite deep reservations of a majority of Americans, congressional leaders plan to ram through their 2,700-page, nearly \$1 trillion proposal, by using a parliamentary maneuver that is both politically treacherous and likely unconstitutional. Article I, section 7 of the Constitution clearly states that a bill must pass both the House and Senate to become law.

I call on leaders of Congress to adhere to our Constitution's requirement of democratic accountability and allow a straight up-or-down vote on the majority party's health care proposal that is opposed by the American people.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the great philosopher George Santayana said, Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Now the Republicans say we should scrap the bill and start all over again. In 1994, Newt Gingrich very proudly killed Mrs. Clinton's health care effort. We have waited 16 years. Twelve years we had Republicans in control of this House. We had 6 years with the Republican Senate, a Republican House, and a Republican President—and nothing was offered.

What you're saying today is, Let's kill the Democratic bill, and we'll wait another 16 years to 2026 until we try again. The Americans are going into bankruptcy—two-thirds of them because of health care. We cannot wait any longer. The time has come for a vote, folks. Let's stand up and tell the American people you want to wait until 2026 to try again. That doesn't make sense.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, the health care debate has roused the American public like few other issues ever have. For months, the American people have stood up and said they don't want the government in charge of health care and they don't want the bill that's currently moving through Congress. Now I've received thousands of emails and phone calls and letters from my constituents, and the vast majority of them are opposed to this bill. But how long will it take for Washington to listen to the American public?

Congress should heed the will of the American people and start over on bipartisan reform that will lower health care costs for everyone. But instead, the Speaker and the House leadership are now suggesting they may pass this controversial bill without Members even actually having to vote on it. Using a legislative sleight-of-hand to pass an unpopular bill represents an arrogance in Washington that Americans find so frustrating about politics and business as usual in Congress.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, the American people are fed up with the most costly health care system in the world with too little good health to show for it. We are 38th of 195 countries in life expectancy. Pity those who think they can run on the theme: "Repeal health care reform." Democrats opposed Bush's version of prescription drugs for seniors because, unlike our

health care bill that's coming to the floor, the Bush plan added billions to the deficit, didn't pay for the bill, and cut seniors off with the doughnut hole. But we never ran on the outrageous theme "repeal prescription drugs for seniors." Instead, we vowed to fix the prescription drug law if Americans would give us control of the Congress. They did—and we are. We are closing the doughnut hole, and we are paying for it. You're entitled to criticize, indeed to change the health care reform Americans have been waiting for for almost a hundred years. But it is simply a fool's errand to oppose it, and madness to try to repeal it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, from The Cincinnati Enquirer to The Washington Post, the editorials today tell the Democrats to stop this health care reform and start again. I agree because I've always based my work on health care on increasing access. This bill fails at increasing overall access. The Senate bill expands Medicaid to cover families earning up to 133 percent of poverty level. The Medicaid rolls will explode under this proposal. But what does that mean? Some 40 percent of family practice physicians currently do not accept Medicaid patients. This is expected to increase to 60 percent. Some 60 percent of specialists currently do not accept Medicaid patients. This is expected to skyrocket to 80 percent.

This bill expands Medicaid beyond its capacity to absorb patients, it cuts Medicare for seniors, and leaves malpractice tort reform untouched and skyrocketing costs in place. This bill has the potential to bankrupt rural hospitals that have a disproportionate share of the problems inherent in the bill. This adds up to less access and lower quality. That is not reform.

REAFFIRM BONDS WITH ISRAEL

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, the United States and Israel have long shared an important friendship. That friendship is rooted in close moral and strategic bonds built on common values, common interests, and common concerns. Today, that friendship is being tested, but we must not allow ourselves to be distracted from the concerns and goals that bring us together. The threat of a nuclear Iran is too great and the peace process is too important for us to spend more time engaging in critical rhetoric of our most important ally. It is time to put aside the rhetoric and reaffirm our bonds with Israel.

We must make it clear that we are united in our opposition to a nuclear

Iran. While no one gains by an escalation of tensions, we must make it clear that we value and support our relationship with the State and the people of Israel.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CALVERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, right now, behind closed doors, negotiations are taking place on the \$1 trillion bill to provide for the government takeover of health care. I find it baffling that instead of talking about jobs, my friends on the other side of the aisle continue a path toward radically changing 20 percent of our economy. Small businesses continue to struggle, but rather than creating an environment that eases financial burdens on business, the administration and this Congress are creating uncertainty through health care takeovers, cap-and-tax, deficit spending, looming tax increases. A recent analysis of the current health care bill shows that it could cost America 1 million jobs by the end of this decade. That is unacceptable.

I recently polled my constituents. Two-thirds are absolutely opposed to the health care bill. They want Congress to start over and focus on items we agree on. Let's return to the question of how we can make health care more accessible, more efficient, and less expensive. Let's kill this bill and save American freedom and our economy.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. SCHWARTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Families across our Nation understand deeply and personally that the status quo in health care is not working. They're calling upon us through millions of supportive calls, emails, and messages to Congress to pass a uniquely American solution to ensure that all Americans have access to meaningful, affordable health coverage. And that is what this Congress is committed to do.

Health care reform means commonsense consumer protections like prohibiting insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions, a provision that was supported by bipartisan, unanimous vote last night in the Budget Committee. It means affordable, private health care options. Choices for individuals and small businesses. It means strengthening Medicare for seniors, which means closing that doughnut hole—the gap in prescription coverage for too many seniors; improving quality and efficiency in health care services; and containing the rising cost of health care, a challenge that faces all of us as taxpayers and as purchasers of health care and health coverage.

Our plan builds on America's public-private system. It is not only paid for, but it reduces the Federal deficit by \$100 billion. Passing health care reform benefits all of us. The status quo is unacceptable. Now is the time to act.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Yesterday, Bloomberg reported what Moody's has been saying all year. Moody's once again reminded the United States that we are moving "substantially" closer to losing our AAA credit rating due to the rising cost of our debt service. The U.S. will spend 7 percent of our revenue this year just on servicing our debt. By 2013, Moody's estimates, we will spend 11 percent of our revenue just to pay the interest on our national debt. This would be a higher percentage than every other top-rated country.

Fortunately, we can protect our credit rating by reining in runaway spending and reducing our debt. But what does this President and this Democrat-controlled Congress do? They want to ram down a new huge entitlement program called the health care bill, riddled with awful policy and budget gimmicks that mask its true impact, through the House, maybe even without an official vote. The truth is, this health care bill is going to choke our economy and saddle our children with \$500 billion in new taxes and deficits far worse than they are now.

PASS THE HIRE ACT

(Mr. CARDOZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARDOZA. Few regions in the Nation are suffering more from the recession than the San Joaquin Valley of California. The three biggest cities in my district—Merced, Stockton, and Modesto—have some of the highest foreclosure and unemployment rates in the country. As I've said before, my district has been economically ravaged at the level equal to the devastation that we have seen oftentimes in the aftermath of hurricanes.

Twelve days ago, the Democratic Congress passed the HIRE Act to help create jobs, strengthen our economy, and to bring help to the communities like mine that need it. It provides tax incentives and credits for businesses to hire unemployed workers and to help small businesses invest and expand. This commonsense legislation will help countless unemployed Americans back onto company payrolls. It's high time for the Senate to finally pass this bill and send it to President Obama. Nowhere is this bill more necessary than in the San Joaquin Valley. We needed help last week, and we needed it a year ago. Economic relief for my constituents remain long overdue. It's time to

stop playing political games and start providing it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, my Democratic colleagues continue to tout claims that this health care bill is "completely paid for" and "will bring down the deficit." But those claims are patently false. The accounting assumptions Democrats have given the Congressional Budget Office to score this bill are nothing short of an Enron-style gimmick. Just look at the most glaring example. The bill counts 10 years of tax increases, amounting to nearly half a trillion dollars, and 10 years of Medicare cuts, also a half a trillion dollars, but it only counts for 6 years of spending.

So what is the real cost of this bill? What does it cost when you compare 10 years of spending with 10 years of taxes and Medicare cuts? \$2.3 trillion. That's nowhere near budget neutral and will drive the deficit up much higher than it already is. Let us defeat this bill.

□ 1245

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, it's time for us to stop talking in generalities and gibberish. It's time to start talking about real people and their real experiences. One thing all of us can agree on is that we trust our doctors. I just received a letter from a doctor in my district, Michael Bresler, who is an ER doc. Four years ago, his insurance premium to Anthem Blue Cross for his family of four was \$539 a month. This year that same policy will cost him \$2,008 a month, a 373 percent increase since 2006. What makes this especially hard to take is that in 2005, Dr. Bresler and his practice were forced by Blue Cross to accept a contract with a 60 percent reduction in payments. Dr. Bresler calls Anthem Blue Cross "robber barons." I assume he uses harsher language when he is not corresponding with Congress.

Madam Speaker, this is not a fight among Democrats and Republicans. This is a fight between robber barons, the insurance industry, and American doctors, families and working people.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. The next few days will tell the American people whether Congress represents their interests and

their will. The American people do not want this health care bill to become law. In my district, they strongly and vocally oppose this plan, and I hear this every day in phone calls and emails, people coming into my office. But I also hear it when I go to the grocery store or to a restaurant in my district. People come up and tell me, BILL, oppose this bill. Stop this bill. And I fully intend on voting against it.

I have also talked to the small businesses and large businesses across this country. They oppose it also because it's creating great uncertainty for them, and this great uncertainty is causing harm to our economy. They're not hiring new employees because of the uncertainty of the cost this bill will have on them. They're not investing in their businesses because of the uncertainty these mandates will have, will push down onto their businesses. This is exactly the kind of uncertainty that's keeping our unemployment rate at 10 percent, and job creation is stagnant. The Democrats' health care plan is reckless, and I believe it will put America on a path to financial ruin.

THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEVADA

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, last week I hosted a telephone town hall with more than 3,500 people tuned in from District Three. This was an excellent opportunity to hear directly from my constituents about the issues that are important to their lives. This was the sixth telephone town hall that I participated in. In addition, we've answered some 95,000 letters, held 10 Congress on the Corners, and hosted five housing workshops.

These means of communication have helped me to be a powerful voice for the people of District Three and to provide as much transparency as possible about the proceedings here in Washington. In fact, thanks to these efforts, I've put \$1.6 million directly into the pockets of southern Nevadans by fighting for veterans to get their benefits, seniors to get their Social Security benefits, and homeowners to receive loan modifications that keep them in their homes. I've made it a top priority to stay closely connected to my constituents, fighting for them in Washington while serving them in southern Nevada. I encourage them to call on me any time.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GRIFFITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to encourage the rejection of this health care bill. The American people have spoken out time after time, and I'm puzzled why Congress is

still considering it. Done in secrecy, this bill will cost jobs, raise taxes, and slash Medicare benefits. And as a physician, I know this bill will be bad for patients. It's terrible for our economy, and it's damaging to the very people we are trying to help.

Although the past is no guarantee of the future, it is, however, instructive. This administration has a failed stimulus package, a failed banking system, a failed cap-and-trade, and numerous questionable interventions into General Motors, AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and others. This kind of track record gives the American public no reason to trust this administration with its health care. I urge my colleagues to listen to the will of the American people and vote "no."

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, the process which the Democratic majority will reportedly use to ram their costly government health care program through this House is truly deplorable and likely unconstitutional. Article I, section 7 of the Constitution clearly states that both Chambers must pass their bills by a vote. Then the bill is sent to the President for his signature before we can reconcile a bill here in Congress.

It's unconscionable to disregard these principles after the American people have clearly said "no" to this plan. They've told Congress to go back to the drawing board and find a solution. It's wrong to flaunt the Constitution and the will of the American people by forcing this proposal down their throats.

Madam Speaker, it will be a sad day for this institution and our great Nation if a proposal of this nature comes to the floor of the House under these circumstances.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, we have been debating health care reform for over 1 year. Today I am urging my colleagues to step up to the plate with courage and vote for passage of this critical legislation. If we don't move forward, the American people will be faced with grave consequences due to our inaction. Rising health costs are crushing American families, forcing small businesses to choose between health care and jobs.

Madam Speaker, \$1 out of every \$6 in the U.S. economy is spent on health care today. If we do nothing, in 30 years \$1 out of every \$3 in our economy will be tied up in health care. If we fail to pass health care reform, families

could see their spending on premiums and out-of-pocket insurance costs rise 34 percent in 5 years and 79 percent in 10 years. Without reform, every 4 years 3.5 million American jobs will be lost. More importantly, if we fail to pass reform, insurance companies will be allowed to continue to deny coverage for preexisting conditions. Insurance companies will be allowed to drop coverage when you get sick.

I urge you to pass this bill now.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I am deeply concerned by reports that the majority party may try to move the health care reform bill through the House without a vote. To move such sweeping legislation, especially considering the price tag, using a parliamentary gimmick is unconscionable. The majority of the American people do not support the health care reform bill presently before Congress. It spends money we don't have, cuts the Medicare program when we should be coming up with ways to get our financial house in order and make sure the Medicare program is protected. The American people want a bipartisan bill that fixes what is broken and keeps what is working.

Where is the accountability? Where is the transparency? America expects more and deserves more. This morning The Washington Post said that what the Democrats are threatening to do is "unseemly." There needs to be an up-or-down vote on health care reform, not on a procedural sleight of hand.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. I often wonder what part of the world our colleagues are living in on the other side of the aisle. I arrived here on November 5. On November 6 there was an up-or-down vote on a major health reform bill in this House. The Senate did it just before Christmas. I think it was Christmas Eve. There has been an up-or-down vote, and now this week we will have an opportunity to take up this bill, pass it on to the President, get it signed, and simultaneously make corrections in the Senate. It sounds to me like that's an open process, and we've been at this now for more than a year here and this Nation for more than a century, trying to provide health care for all.

And let's keep in mind that our economy absolutely demands that we take action now. Seventeen percent of our economy is being used. The more we spend, the more uninsured we have. We solve those problems with this bill. It's

time for action. It's time to stop saying "no" and get on with solving a major fundamental problem here in America.

A REPUBLIC OR A MONARCHY?

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, 233 years ago this May, a group of American patriots met in Philadelphia to create a Constitution which has been the guiding light to freedom-loving people around the world. Now, as we gather here, the majority is planning a procedural gimmick to get around having to vote for a health care bill that Americans don't want or can't afford. Let's not circumvent the Constitution. Outside Independence Hall when the Constitutional Convention concluded in September of 1787, a Mrs. Powell of Philadelphia is reported to have asked Benjamin Franklin, "Well, Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?" With no hesitation whatsoever, Franklin responded, "A Republic, if you can keep it." Let's keep this Constitution.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HIRONO. Your health or your home? Americans should not have to make this choice, but all too often they have to because of the high cost of health care. Lesley Czechowicz of Kihei, Maui, called my office yesterday to tell me about her 20-year-old niece. Last year, her niece collapsed and fell into a seizure. Medics rushed her to the hospital; and, ultimately, she was diagnosed with epilepsy.

Her niece had a part-time retail job that did not offer health insurance to their employees. Because of the emergency care and subsequent follow-up visits to the doctor, her niece was recently forced to sell her house so that she could pay her medical bills. Lesley called me because she wanted to make sure I would support health care reform. She told me that while it's too late for her niece, it's not too late for our country. I couldn't agree more.

Private health insurance companies run a business. Their goal is to make money for their shareholders. They pay their CEOs millions of dollars a year while raising health care costs for the rest of us. Whose side are you on?

SLAUGHTER HOUSE RULE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we're having the vote of the century on the Senate health care bill, but there's a sneaky snake oil gimmick afoot to pass the bill without voting on it.

First, we're passing bills without reading them, and now they want us to pass bills without actually voting on the bill. The trick is to deem the Senate bill passed without ever having a straight up-or-down vote. And it's a trick.

When we vote on the rules for debate, they want to make that count as the vote on the health care bill instead of actually voting on the health care bill. Let's have an up-or-down vote on this bill and not hide behind some procedural mumbo jumbo. The Constitution says: "But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by Yeas and Nays." It doesn't say anything about "deeming" in the Constitution.

To obtain votes for government-run health care, backroom secret deals are being made in the caverns of this building, and it's shameful. This is passing the government health care bill by any sneaking means necessary, including slaughtering the House rules.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1300

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) was indeed correct. It's going to be a historic vote of 100 years that started with Teddy Roosevelt, who talked about the need for health care in this country. And that debate was continued by Richard Nixon, and it was also advocated by Howard Baker. It's been bipartisan for 100 years that we need health care reform in this country. And it's never been more critical than now, when it's eating up our Federal budget, our individuals' budgets, and hurting us economically.

But beyond that, we need a compassionate and responsible government, and we have a President who is compassionate, responsible, and trying, like Nelson Mandela, to reach out to his former enemies and have bipartisanship. And he's had none of it, but he continues to try. And we need to support this President, support our country, preserve our economy, and provide health care like every other industrialized nation in this world does, and make America among the leaders and not the followers.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, the Democrat claims that the Obama health care bill will reduce the debt and help balance the budget, but reviewing those calculations shows that they're going to collect higher taxes for 10 years and provide health care for only 6 years. Imagine that.

Isn't that a little misleading? Four years of health care taxes with no health care.

Imagine if you wanted to buy a house and you had to make 4 years of payments before you could move in, and then finally when you moved in, you found out you had rationed use of the property. You couldn't choose where to park your car, like in the garage. You had to drive blocks away down to a public parking lot and then wait in line for a stall.

Ten years of taxes, 6 years of benefits, followed by rationed care. You wouldn't buy a house under those terms, and Congress shouldn't pass a health care bill under those terms either.

We can do better. We can have health care reform that lowers costs by addressing preexisting conditions, by lowering defensive medicine costs, by having commonsense tort reform.

The Republican alternative lowers the price of health care by 10 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office. That's what this Congress ought to pass.

I deem back the balance of my time.

WE MUST HAVE REFORM

(Mr. MOORE of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I want to read to you an email I just received from one of my staffers back in Overland Park, Kansas, my Congressional office there. It came at 11:55 a.m.:

"When I leave this job and have to seek new insurance, I will be largely uninsurable due to my preexisting condition, breast cancer, whether I show any remaining signs of the disease at that time or not.

"I was so fortunate last year to have this job and Federal employee insurance. The cancer treatment I received cost over \$50,000. My husband and I would have lost every penny we had and then some if we had not had this quality coverage.

"Without a bill like this one, I will likely not have access to that kind of coverage ever again due to my cancer diagnosis at the age of 24. Without quality coverage, and if, God forbid, I should ever have to go through this again, it would undoubtedly break us that time around.

"We must have reform.

"Thank you, Dennis."

This, folks, is what it's all about, people like this around the country. We've got to do something and reform our health insurance system, our health care system.

LET'S HAVE AN UP-OR-DOWN VOTE

(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I think that there's unanimous will on both

sides of this Chamber to take care of the uninsurable people because of pre-existing conditions right now, but this side is willing to address that on stand-alone legislation, or it would have already have been passed, unfortunately. I am surprised they keep pounding on that over and over and over again.

Yesterday, in Ohio, the President said the Democrats needed courage to pass his national health care plan. Sadly, as we speak, leaders across the aisle are meeting behind closed doors to invent a creative way to approve the President's health care plan without requiring Members of the House to take an up-or-down vote on the actual bill. The legitimacy of something as controversial as the health care bill would be further clouded by such clever parliamentary maneuvers.

That's not courage. That's malfeasance. It's an absolute betrayal of the public trust, and it would represent an unprecedented abuse of power that would take this Nation down a dangerous path.

We're a Nation of laws. When these laws are not convenient, you shouldn't simply ignore them. We should follow them, regardless of the outcome; otherwise, everything about our democratic Republic is at risk.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. CLARKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, we all know that health care costs are unsustainable. They're still crushing families, small businesses and large companies alike. When people lose their jobs, they lose their health insurance. Even people who do have jobs and want coverage but have preexisting conditions still couldn't get coverage.

We are closer than ever to reforming our Nation's broken health insurance system with a plan that puts America back in control of their health care choices, holds insurance companies accountable, and makes coverage more affordable.

As we move forward through this legislative process, I am confident that our bill will make health insurance affordable for the middle class and small businesses by reducing premiums and out-of-pocket costs, give millions of Americans access to affordable insurance choices through a new, competitive health insurance market, and hold insurance companies accountable to keep premiums down and prevent denials of coverage, including for pre-existing conditions. And it will close the disastrous doughnut hole that seniors are having to chose between life-saving medication and food to eat.

For over 12 years, the once Republican-led Congress has failed to do this. We're going to do it now.

HEALTH CARE AND THE SLAUGHTER RULE

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, Article I, section 7 of the Constitution says that in order for a bill to become law, it shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate; yet yesterday, Speaker PELOSI endorsed the so-called Slaughter rule, which would merely deem that the House has passed the Senate health care bill and then send it to President Obama to sign without a direct recorded vote. This scheme is misguided, arrogant, and fundamentally wrong.

The Speaker reportedly added, nobody wants to vote for the Senate bill. Given the facts that, among other things, the \$1 trillion bill is marred with special deals, mandates, tax hikes, and Medicare cuts, it is no wonder they don't want to vote for it.

Considering the wide-ranging effects this trillion-dollar effort to change health care will have, the American people deserve a clear, up-or-down vote on this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, between the year 2000 and 2006, the Republicans had the House, the Senate, and the White House, and they did nothing of good to help the American people. And now you listen to them and it sounds like they actually are for health care for the American people. But if they were for the American people, they would have done something in those 6 years about people being affected by rescission, by preexisting condition, by carrying young people on the health care policy of their parents until they're 26, about doing something about this doughnut hole. They'd have done something about it. But they didn't do anything other than make the problem worse.

And if you listen to them today, you would think they cared, but the evidence is before the American people, they did nothing at all. And now we are going to do something about it within a little more than 1 year of coming into office.

Who's on your side, America? You'll find out this week.

THE HOUSE HEALTH CARE VOTE AND THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, yesterday's Wall Street Journal highlights the process by which Democrats are trying to pass

this government health care takeover. The process is just as bad as the provisions of the bill.

Professor Michael McConnell, Director of the Constitutional Law Center at Stanford Law School, wrote the article entitled, "House Health Care Vote and the Constitution." Mr. McCONNELL presents the process called the Slaughter solution, which is nothing more than a procedural trick that deems the Senate bill passed without ever having a straight up-or-down vote.

The article explains, "The Slaughter solution cannot be squared with Article I, section 7 of the Constitution. Senate rules protect against majoritarian overreach by allowing a determined minority to filibuster most types of legislation."

Madam Speaker, Americans need jobs, not a law which NFIB claims will kill 1.6 million jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, opponents often cite polls saying the American people don't want Congress to pass health care reform, but I've talked to my constituents and I've listened closely to what they expect from the system. They don't think preexisting conditions should stop you from getting coverage. Insurance companies shouldn't just drop you. And nobody, nobody should face one-time 40 percent increases in premiums like what just happened in California.

Madam Speaker, it has been a difficult and a long debate, but we're closer than any time in history to putting into law the health security Americans want. Let's finish the job and put patients first.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, the American people continue to say in every opportunity that they can that they don't want a government takeover of health care. And all they get from the tone-deaf liberals that are running Congress is this latest attempt to ram the bill through. And now this latest proposal is the Slaughter solution where they're even going to try to run it through without an actual vote.

Now, maybe some of them have been around so long that they forget what Article I, section 7 of the Constitution says, but it actually takes a vote here in this House for any bill to pass. And I hope their bill doesn't pass, because we need health care reform. We need to lower the cost of health care, which their bill doesn't do. We need to address preexisting conditions. But we

don't want a government takeover of health care.

If you listen to the American people, what they're saying very loudly and clearly is scrap this bill. Let's go back to the table and start over again.

Now, Speaker PELOSI and her liberal lieutenants might run Congress, but the American people run this country, and their voices will be heard.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, every time I hear a Republican talking about health care reform, they say the American people don't want it. They say it so much that I think they're beginning to try to convince themselves that it's true. But there's a national poll that shows what the real story is.

They asked, of all the people who are opposed to health care or say they are, how many are opposed to it because they don't think it goes far enough. Forty percent. Almost 40 percent said that was the reason. They will not be unhappy when we pass health care reform. They will be ecstatic, like the shopkeeper I talked to over Christmas who said she was against what we're doing because she has diabetes and she can't wait 4 years for the help she needs.

No, the American people will applaud us when we pass comprehensive health care reform, and I will consider it the proudest moment of my service.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. AKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, as I walk across back and forth from the Cannon Building to come to this Chamber, there is a wall in the steam tunnel of all of these different pictures that are painted by our high school students, and one continues to arrest my progress.

A beautiful little redheaded girl about 17 years old who looks like my daughter, and has beautiful lighting on her face. And as you look into her face, she has a profound sadness there. And the thought has crossed my mind that that's how my daughters will look if this bill passes with government rationing of health care, with the budget busted, with the destruction of our economy, and unemployment out of control.

We need to fix health care, but we don't need to destroy American health care or the American economy. That would be sad indeed.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, Members, we, as Members of Congress, this week have a choice. We have a choice between voting with the people who need health care or voting with the insurance corporations who have fouled this system up for decades.

The bill that we're going to deal with, the consumers select their insurance plan and their company. Consumers select their doctors. Consumers make treatment decisions with their doctors. Consumers will keep coverage they have if they change their jobs.

The insurance companies will have less control. Insurance companies will no longer be able to deny coverage or revoke coverage for preexisting conditions. Insurance companies will no longer be allowed to cap medical costs that people run into all the time for treatment. Insurance companies will no longer be allowed to drop coverage when you get sick. Insurance companies will have to compete for business.

That's why we have a choice. Whose side is your Member of Congress on, with the people who need health care or the ones who want to sell it?

□ 1315

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. The gentleman from Missouri earlier gave a lovely image, and I would like to use image as well. I would like to use the image of President Obama saying over and over and over to the American people, "If you like your health insurance, you can keep it." And this bill does not fulfill the President's promise.

Yesterday in the House Budget Committee we worked for 8 hours to instruct the Rules Committee on how to make this a better bill. And we asked them to make the President's promise come true, to pass an amendment that says if you like your health insurance you can keep it. And that was killed on a party-line vote, with all of the Republicans voting to help the President fulfill his promise to the American people and the Democrats voting against it. This bill does not fulfill the President's promise that if you like your insurance you can keep it.

I urge that we kill this misguided health care bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. In listening to this debate back and forth, I can't help but be struck by the fact that many of the arguments from the other side of the aisle are simply not arguments against this health care bill. I have heard people rail against a government takeover

of health care. Well, this bill actually helps reduce the number of people that depend on government programs for their health care. This bill will help end reliance on government for health care.

I have heard people say that this is somehow a rush to get to a bill. Well, we have been working on this for well over a year. When we first started over a year ago, I had calls to my office saying, "Why are you going so quickly? Why don't you slow down and get it right?" Now I am getting a lot of calls to my office saying, "Pass health care already. It's all you've been talking about."

It is time to pass this bill because what is in it is popular with the American people: letting kids and young people stay on their parents' policy until they are 26, ending pricing discrimination based upon preexisting conditions, helping make insurance more affordable for people who are self-employed and in small businesses. That is what is in this bill, and that is what the American people support.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WHITFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, since the founding of this great country, representatives of the people have come to this floor, this Chamber, to debate legislation and either vote for it or against it. If you support legislation, stand up and support it. If you are opposed to it, stand up and oppose it.

But today's Washington Post says that House Speaker NANCY PELOSI suggested Monday that she might attempt to pass the health care bill without having Members vote on it. Instead, she would rely on a procedural sleight of hand: The House would vote on a more popular piece of legislation, but under the House rule for that vote, passage would signify that lawmakers "deem" the health care bill to be passed. Speaker PELOSI added that she prefers this tactic because it would politically protect lawmakers who are reluctant to publicly support the health care bill. She says, "It's more insider and process-oriented than most people want to know, but I like it because people don't have to vote on the health care bill."

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. My voice is not quite clear, but I hope, Madam Speaker, that you can hear me.

We are hearing so much talk, and you know why? Because we are at a point where we are going to choose consumers over insurance companies. And it is time for that to happen. Insurance companies have held this public hostage for many years, controlling

them. When we talk about rationing, that is who is rationing. They tell the physicians what to do, they tell the hospitals what to do. It is time to take the insurance companies out of control and let the people have their right to pick their health care.

We have always said if you have a health care plan you like, keep it. We are trying to make sure that the people that the insurance companies will not insure or will drop get a chance to have health insurance. This is misplaced anger because these insurance companies are spending a million dollars a day to kill this bill. And their cheering squad is right over here to my left.

We have got to do this for the people. It is time for the people to have a choice in their health care.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. JORDAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, what part of “no” don’t the Democrats get? They were going to pass this health care bill last September and the American people said “no.” They were going to pass it in October and the American people said “no.” They said we’re going to get it done by Thanksgiving and the American people said “no.” Oh, we’re going to get it done by Christmas and the American people said “no.” We’re going to get it done by the State of the Union and the American people said “no.” And now they say, oh, we’re going to get it done before Easter, and the American people continue to say “no.” What part of “no” don’t they get?

The American people don’t want this big government takeover. They want real reform that will help them, their small businesses, and their families. That is what we should be doing, not taking this over by the government.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen, the question that we have got to ask ourselves this day is whose side are you on? Are you on the insurance companies’ side or are you on the American people’s side?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the American people are in pain. There are 13,000 American people who are losing their insurance every day. There are American people who are being denied coverage because of a preexisting condition by insurance companies. Whose side are you on? There are senior citizens who, because of the doughnut hole, cannot have the level of treatment for their prescription drugs that they should have because of the insurance companies. The American people are sick and tired, quite honestly, of being sick and tired of our waiting.

Now, we have had arguments to say why don’t we start over. Ladies and gentlemen, the insurance companies aren’t starting over. They have already raised the rates in California by 30 percent just 2 weeks ago. The side to be on is the American people’s side.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, we talk about reform—we’re for reform and you’re for reform. But 2,700 pages of what? 2,700 pages. The Bible only has 1,341 pages in it.

Let me give you an example on page 752 of this bill. Let me read it to you:

“Eligibility for non-traditional individuals with income below 133 percent of the Federal poverty level. (1) In general. Section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(a)(10)(A)(i) is amended by striking “or” at the end of subclause (VI); by adding “or” at the end of subclause (VII); and by adding at the end the following new subclause: (VIII) who are under 65 years of age, who are not described in previous subclauses of this clause, and who are in families whose income (determined using methodologies and procedures specified by the Secretary in consultation with the Health Choices Commissioner) does not exceed 133 1/3 percent of the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981).

Now, did anybody understand that?

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I couldn’t be more pleased to have spent the last year and a few months working on this issue and to be here this month where we may get the opportunity to vote on this bill.

Because I want to tell you, Madam Speaker, what I hear from my constituents is get this bill done. When are you going to move forward on this? It is not a perfect bill. In fact, 50 percent of the doctors in my State wish we were passing a single-payer health care bill. But this is going to go a long way.

We have heard a lot of talk about process. When are we going to talk about the process of insurance companies? The process that denies my constituents coverage because of a preexisting condition. The times I hear from people who say their health care was cut off. And in my State, where Anthem Blue Cross wants to continually raise rates. You know, last year they asked for a 23 percent increase. When our insurance commissioner said no, you know what they did? They sued the State of Maine.

Well, I am ready to make sure that we are standing for our constituents, passing this health care bill, and doing away with the bad process of the insurance companies.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this week March Madness comes to college basketball teams as teams across America meet in the NCAA Tournament. And this week March Madness also comes to this House in the culmination of this health care debate.

The American people have watched as this bill has lumbered forward for the past year, and they have been outraged by both the substance and the process. The American people want jobs, Madam Speaker, but this bill is funded with job-killing tax increases.

Seniors need the protection of Medicare, but this bill cuts \$500 billion from that vital program. We all want freedom, of course, but this bill includes an unconstitutional mandate requiring individuals to purchase government-approved health care or face taxes, fines, or even jail.

The American people have been outraged at the vote buying epitomized by the Louisiana Purchase, the Cornhusker Kickback, and Gator Aid. And now the Democratic leadership is preparing to pass this bill without actually voting on it and deeming the bill passed through trickery.

It is time to end Washington’s version of March Madness and do what the American people are asking us to do, and that is to start over with a clean sheet of paper and look for real health care reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I am from Ohio’s Sixth District, my district is in Appalachian Ohio, and we have a large population of seniors and retirees, so I’m truly interested in how this reform bill strengthens Medicare. If we don’t do anything, the Medicare trust fund is projected to be insolvent by 2016. Medicare takes care of our seniors, but it is high time that we take care of Medicare.

The health care reform bill keeps Medicare solvent for 9 more years. We extend that timeline by finally getting tough on the waste in Medicare. So as we make services better for seniors, we also fight fraud and waste.

The inspector general of the Health and Human Services Department has found a number of problems in Medicare with false claims for wheelchairs and orthotics, and overcharging for devices and prescription drugs. We need

to provide the tools to strengthen our enforcement mechanisms and fight these abuses.

I thank leadership for providing a long and thoughtful examination of health care, one of the most pressing issues of our time. I look forward to reading the bill soon.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Democrats' latest health care plan. For the past year, my constituents in South Carolina have done everything they can to make it clear they do not want a government take-over of health care. Yet here we are again today discussing a plan that calls for more taxes, more regulations, more spending, and more Federal control over our current health care system. This legislation is not what the American people want, and it lacks a single ounce of Republican support.

Despite the overwhelming opposition, Democrats continue to push their partisan agenda and have made it clear they will use any means possible to get what they want. This is a bad bill for South Carolina and it's a bad bill for the entire country.

I join my constituents in asking the Democrats to scrap this legislation and start over on bipartisan health care reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, our colleagues on the other side say they want to start over, completely over. They would like to privatize Social Security. They would like to make sure that Medicare, a program that has served our seniors so well over all of these years, is also, well, doesn't just wither on the vine, as Speaker Gingrich wanted it to do, they want to ban it, end it for people under 55 years of age.

The other side would like to frame this issue as a matter of process. It is a matter of process, insurance process and them denying people claims even on their way to the operating table. This is why we are putting forth this bill to reform insurance and create health care for this entire country that they can depend upon and rely on.

It becomes a question of whose side you are on in the final analysis. Are you siding with the insurance industry and the great job that they have done raising rates all across this Nation? Or are you standing with the American people and fighting on their behalf? That is what the people of this great country of ours want to know.

□ 1330

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. The proponents of this health reform package are misleading the American public into believing that you can raise the baseline and reduce spending at the same time. You cannot expect to expand coverage to millions of individuals and to curb costs.

The Medicaid program already pays doctors and hospitals at levels well below those of Medicare and private insurance. And most of the time, below actual costs. Many doctors, therefore, do not accept Medicaid patients and the cuts may further discourage participation.

The most devastating cuts to the States' Federal Medicaid match have been deferred because of relief from the stimulus package. Those deferments end in December.

The health care bill before us now is a disaster waiting to happen and an expansion of an already broken program.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. HALVORSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HALVORSON. Throughout this entire health care reform debate, two numbers have concerned me more than others: 130 and 60. These numbers represent the health insurance costs that small businesses are facing and the effects on those who work for small businesses. Small businesses have seen their premiums go up 130 percent over the last decade. And of all of those Americans who are uninsured, 60 percent of them are small business owners, employees, and their families.

Madam Speaker, I believe America is facing a health care crisis, and I believe that we need to act to bring down costs for regular families and hold health care and insurance companies accountable.

Too many Americans are denied care because of preexisting conditions. Too many businesses are being priced out of affordable health care. We need health care reform that addresses these issues.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LEE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEE of New York. Within days, the House is poised to vote on a massive government takeover of health care. This trillion dollar, 2,000-page monstrosity will kill jobs, increase our debt, and raise taxes on working Americans. And it's a "pay now, buy later" approach: While the taxes start right away, the benefits don't begin until 2014.

In essence, this new entitlement program requires 10 years of new tax in-

creases and 10 years of cuts to popular programs like Medicare Advantage to pay for just 6 years of this new government expansion over health care. It's a smoke-and-mirrors approach to ram through a new entitlement we surely can't afford to pay.

The American people aren't that easily deceived. The people in my district of western New York want tangible solutions in taking real costs out. We need to start over.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The utter hypocrisy of the debate about process is absolutely astonishing. I just learned that Speaker Hastert used the technique of a self-executing rule 113 times. Then we hear the Republicans attack reconciliation—which really means a majority of votes—and yet call for an up-or-down vote in the House.

News flash: People in the real world don't care about self-executing rules or reconciliation and don't even know what it is.

What they do care about process is the process of the insurance companies. Not the process of reconciliation, the process of rescission, which means canceling policies when you get cancer; the process of refusing a child who has asthma; the process of raising prices 39 percent, 50 percent, 60 percent, for your insurance policy.

We each have the opportunity in the next few days to be on the right or wrong side of history. We can either stand with the American people or with the insurance companies. I hope that the vast majority of us stick with the American people.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, how bad is this health bill? Oh, my goodness. Let me count the ways. It's bad on policy, raises taxes \$500 billion, decreases quality of care, decreases choices for Americans, slashes Medicare by \$500 billion. It's bad on process, with backroom, secret, shady deals made that Americans abhor.

But as a physician, I know that mostly it's bad for patients. They know it will destroy quality care. They know it will dictate to them what doctor they have to see and where they have to see him or her, and they know it will result in more money being paid by them for less care—which is all the more troubling because there are so many more positive solutions like H.R. 3400, which would get Americans covered with insurance they want, not what the government wants for them. It would solve preexisting and portability problems with insurance that they want,

not what the government wants for them, and address the lawsuit abuse that is so badly needed and is not addressed in the Senate bill.

How bad is this health care bill? Madam Speaker, it's bad enough that the American people are saying, "Just say no."

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it's time to unite behind President Obama's plan. We must deliver affordable health care for the American people. Insurance companies have taken advantage of hardworking Americans for far too long. It's morally wrong to put profits over people, and it must come to an end.

I urge my colleagues to put aside their differences and deliver a victory for the American people. This Congress was elected to accomplish this goal. How can we accomplish this goal of health insurance reform without holding the insurance companies accountable?

I'm for the people of America, and I stand with you. Now is the time for us to, in unity, come together and solve this dilemma for the American people. I urge you to vote "yes" for people over process.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, this time the process is substance. As the Democratic majority prepares to jam President Obama's health care through Congress despite his lack of support from the American people, our constituents need to know what is going on about the process.

Yesterday in Ohio, President Obama demanded that members of his own party show courage and vote for his vision of health care, yet this morning, the front page headline in The Washington Post reads "Pelosi may try to pass health bill without vote."

In the body of this story, the Speaker refers to a procedural scheme to allow the President to sign the Senate-passed health bill without the House actually voting on it or even debating it. She said, "It's more insider and process-oriented than most people want to know. But I like it because people don't have to vote on the Senate bill." Imagine that. Affecting 17 percent of the entire U.S. economy without a public vote in the House.

My colleagues, I ask you, is that courage?

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, in the State of Connecticut last weekend, we had an opportunity to see the health care crisis up close. Mission of Mercy, a national organization that holds free dental clinics, was in Middletown, Connecticut, and Connecticut—the wealthiest per capita income State in America—shattered the Mission of Mercy record, serving 2,045 working adults sleeping in their cars, lining up two nights before to get access to dental care. We're not talking about teeth whitening or teeth cleaning; we're talking about people walking in with abscesses that were so pronounced that it threatened the stability of their jaws, extractions, major surgery. This is the state of health care in America today.

There is one group, though, that doesn't have to sleep in their car to get health care: Members of Congress, who participate in a Federal purchasing exchange subsidized by the American taxpayer. Madam Speaker, how do they demonize a plan which they benefit from every single day courtesy of the American taxpayer? I don't know how they do that.

This week they have an opportunity to help those people who were lined up in their cars over the weekend to get the same access to care that those people who work every day pay with their taxes.

Vote for health care reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, we have talked a lot about how this bill is distracting us from the issue that the American people want us to focus on, and that is jobs. But this bill isn't just merely a distraction. It will have a profoundly negative impact on the job market.

You cannot raise taxes by hundreds of billions of dollars on individuals and businesses and expect that it has no impact on employers and employees. Raising taxes per employee by \$2,000 would not encourage businesses to hire more workers, and workers receiving health care subsidies would see their new Federal entitlement evaporate when their wages increase by too much. Under this bill, more pay could mean less health care, effectively trapping workers in lower-wage jobs. So not only would this discourage job growth, it would discourage wage growth also.

The bottom line is this bill will destroy jobs at a time when we can least afford it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. It's as simple as this: Are you for what the insurance companies

are doing, or are you against it? Do you think it's right to cut your mother off her insurance because she's had a catastrophic cancer? I don't. Do you think it's right to deny your sister insurance because she had a cesarean section? Do you think it's right for insurance companies to raise rates 39 percent all at one time, forcing businesses to choose between health care or firing people? I don't.

If you think it's right for the insurance companies to do this to your son, daughter, or mother, join the Republicans in opposing health care reform. I don't think it's right. In fact, I think it's an outrage. That is why I know we must pass health care reform now.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REHBERG. Today, as million of Americans around the country fill out their brackets, March Madness is in the air. Unfortunately, the madness isn't restricted to the basketball court. As Congress rushes to pass a health care bill that is so bad even the majority party can't stomach it, we've got our own case of March Madness right here in Congress, but ours is worse.

With March Madness, every game is played on TV in full view of the American public; in House Madness, the legislation is written in secret behind closed doors. In March Madness, you play for bragging rights; in the House bill in House Madness, it's matters of life and death, one-sixth of the national economy, and more than \$1 trillion in tax dollars.

In March Madness, the team with the most points wins. In House Madness, you rewrite the rules with procedural tricks so that the team with fewer votes can win. It's time to blow the whistle, call a foul, and stop this Madness.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I come here to let you know my mother turned 100 on January 4 after she had a broken hip, and 2 days before Christmas another broken hip, and last night she broke her femur. And just a few minutes ago, they called me to say she was in need of a blood transfusion.

I want you to know the only way we kept the mother of four who put all of us through college is because of Medicare and our insurances.

Madam Speaker, let us not let Americans die unnecessarily. This women's sister—my mother's sister—lived to 106, and I will do everything in my power to be sure that other Americans can benefit from the kind of health care reform we're proposing today.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, everyone wants to make health care more affordable and more accessible, but for the past year, the majority has been working on pieces of a puzzle they call health care reform. And now that their puzzle is complete, the picture doesn't make any sense.

Their final image includes billions of dollars in new taxes, over \$1 trillion in new government, increases the premiums of the 85 percent of those who have health insurance, and cuts Medicare by half a trillion dollars. And I continue to hear from Kentuckians from home who remain concerned over the possible passage of this bill and who are frustrated with this process.

We need to start over. We need to piece together better solutions in an open and honest system. Now is the time to work on incremental reforms that will lower the cost of health care without spending trillions and bankrupting future generations.

□ 1345

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. DeLAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I went to dinner with my family in New Haven, Connecticut. As we left the restaurant, a young woman stopped me. She said to me, ROSA, can I talk to you for a moment? I've been waiting for you. I said, Why didn't you come over to the table? She said, I didn't want to disturb you or your family. No disturbance.

I looked at this beautiful young woman with tears in her eyes. And she said to me, ROSA, I have lung cancer. I have lung cancer, and I cannot get the kind of help that I need. I can't leave my job because I will not be able to get insurance. Preexisting condition is killing me. Pass health care reform.

You don't know Melissa Marotolli. I do, and Melissa Marotolli's face haunts me every single day. And this is not just one story. It is writ large across this Nation, a people who can't leave their jobs; they can't get the care they need because the insurance companies have run roughshod over them. Yes, they are rationing health care in this country. I know where I stand. I stand with the Melissa Marotollis of this Nation. My Republican colleagues stand with the insurance companies.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SCHOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Speaker, this bill really is not about health insurance reform. If you watched the Presi-

dent's televised health care forum, you heard them say it time and time again: This is about entitlement expansion. And that is really where the real debate comes down this center line. Both sides agree that there needs to be health care reform. Republicans have put forward a thoughtful bill since last April promoting reform, competition across State lines, covering people with preexisting conditions, on and on and on.

But how can my friends on the other side of the aisle endorse this bill when the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan determiner of how much these bills cost us, has not come out with their cost estimate for this bill? I know from my home State of Illinois, our Governor is talking about a 50 percent tax increase to pay for \$9 billion in unpaid Medicaid bills. This bill we do know will cost my State of Illinois \$1.89 billion over 5 years just for their match. I don't know how anyone from my State can support this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, some of the most egregious insurance industry practices in our health care system disproportionately harm women, and this needs to change. Under the current system, women pay more and get less and often are denied care. If a woman is of a certain age or is already pregnant, insurers can deny her, of all things, maternity coverage. In eight States, it is still legal for insurance companies to deny a woman coverage if she has been the victim of domestic violence.

These examples illustrate how our current system discriminates against over 50 percent of the population of our country. And that is why I offered a motion on this important issue in last night's Budget Committee hearing. My Republican colleagues joined me in supporting this motion, acknowledging that health care reform must end these harmful insurance practices. So many of the health care reforms that are so important to women, families, and our Nation hang in the balance. We must pass these commonsense changes in our health care system.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, the American people are increasingly rejecting government-run health care. They are saying "no" to backroom deals and gimmicks used by the majority party to ram this bill through by any means necessary. The Democrat leadership has greased the skids to ignore the will of the American people and make their vision of socialized medicine the law of the land.

Abusing the rules of when it suits the majority party's purpose is not what the American people want. Madam Speaker, allow us to do the work we were sent here to do. Let this bill stand or fail on its merits. An issue so important to America's future demands transparency and a legitimate up-or-down vote.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, as a direct result of the White House submit a couple of weeks ago, good ideas from both parties are in this plan. But there is a philosophical difference between the two parties that I think came out last night. On weekends I very often go to the supermarket and see these little notices for beef and beer socials for people trying to raise money for a medical emergency in their family. Most of the people trying to do this have insurance. But their daughter has leukemia or their son is on a ventilator and they ran out of health insurance benefits because they run up against what is called a lifetime policy limit.

Last night, we took a vote on whether or not to abolish those lifetime policy limits so no family should have to do that. Our side voted "yes." Their side voted "no." But Members of Congress, in their own health plan, if our families have this problem, there is no limit on what we get.

So we think that the American people should get the same benefit that the men and women who vote in this Chamber every day do. We believe we should stand on the side of the families of this country, not the insurance industry.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, the health care reform debate has become a farce, and I am outraged. I am outraged at this proposed law. I am outraged at the process. I am outraged at the majority party's sham of a health care bill. But I'm not the only one. The American people are outraged. Americans have marched, they have protested and they have written letters and they have made phone calls. Americans have spoken, Madam Speaker, and they do not want this health care bill.

But the worst part about it is that we may not even vote on it. The majority party wants to deem the Senate bill passed and then hope that the Senate changes the bill later. Was this the hope and the change that we can all believe in? Madam Speaker, this has become a legislative sleight of hand, a gimmick, a parlor trick.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people and kill this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I am outraged also. I am really outraged at the amount of money that the insurance industry has spent trying to defeat this bill that will help the American people. The companies claim they support health reform, just not this bill. But they have done nothing to reform. They could have taken this time to reform. They still deny coverage for preexisting conditions. They still charge exorbitant rates. They still fight antitrust legislation. They still cancel people's policies when they most need them. And they still limit the payments when people get sick.

They have a secret code word. It's called "start over." What they really mean is defeat it; we don't want it. The question has to be here, whose side are you on? Are you on the side of the insurance companies? Or are you on the side of the American public, the people, the small businesses who have to carry the burden of these fees? Whose side are you really on? I am on the side of middle class Americans, small businesses, and those who are healthy and those who are sick.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. McCOTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCOTTER. We live in a very dysfunctional time. We have heard a parade of speakers come to the microphones here in the well of the House and say they stand on the side of the American people. Yet in my 44 years of life, I have never stood on the side of someone who disagrees with me so vehemently.

Overlooking it is a fundamental proposition. The Democratic Party believes that you can take an imperfect health care system and fix it by putting it under the most dysfunctional and broken entity in the United States today. It is called the Federal Government. That proposition is insane. The reality is they do not stand with the American people. They stand for Big Government making decisions in your lives.

We trust the American people, and we will not turn the intimate decisions between you and your doctor over to some Federal bureaucrat. We will leave it in your hands, and we will empower patient-centered wellness and free market reforms if given the chance and a real vote.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, the American people want health reform. They want affordable, reliable care. But after watching the current majority wrangle for over a year to produce gargantuan bills filled with complicated and punitive policies, tax increases and special deals, the American people are right to say, no, we don't trust the current Congress to do this right. They have seen how the Congress has worked over the past year and have rightfully said that it's crazy to give the government greater control over our health care. They look at aspects of the legislation before us and say, yes, there are provisions here that we like, but at what cost? They have projected trillion-dollar deficits stretching to the horizon. And we are told that this big, new entitlement will truly restrain costs. Is that credible?

I believe the more sensible approach is a simpler approach. I would favor expanding health savings accounts coupled with catastrophic insurance and paid for with subsidies when necessary. It is a simple arrangement that everyone can understand and would help to restrain costs because everyone would have incentives to spend carefully. It's not all I would do, but it's understandable.

Instead, the current majority is pushing ahead with a breathtakingly expensive bureaucratic and regulatory monstrosity. This is no way to restructure one-sixth of our economy.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, quality, affordable health care should be a fundamental human right, not a privilege for the few, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have it. Today, 47 million Americans are uninsured, including 9 million kids.

Meanwhile, the CEOs of private insurance and drug companies are raking in huge profits. Take the case of WellPoint. They proposed increasing rates by as much as 39 percent in California, even as they made \$4.2 billion in profits last year and paid out million-dollar compensation packages to their top executives. These rate hikes would hit Democratic and Republican districts alike. And the other side would have us do nothing.

We talk about the big banks making a killing off of taxpayers. Well, insurance company executives are literally getting million-dollar compensation packages while our constituents are dying.

Health reform is long overdue. The 31 million people this bill will cover are Democrats, they are Republicans, they are Independents, they are Greens, and they are people with no party affiliation. This should not be a partisan

issue. The costs of inaction are much too risky, they are much too costly, and we must act now.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, if health care reform weren't such a serious subject, something that will affect every person in America, then what the Democrats are trying to do would prove to provide enough fodder for comedians like Letterman, Leno and Jon Stewart that their writers wouldn't have to work on new jokes for the next month.

Last week, the Speaker of the House said, "We have to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it." That would be like buying a house before checking it out to see how many bedrooms were in it or what the colors were or whether we could even afford it in the first place. Most Americans don't buy shoes without trying them on, buy a car without test driving it, much less support a takeover of our health care system that will include life-changing decisions that are being kept from you in the dark.

This morning, the Speaker said we may actually vote on the health care bill without voting on it, something that she calls "deem and pass." What a pesky little thing voting is, you know, where those of us who work for you have to actually cast our votes first so you can find out whether you should vote for us in November.

This is an insult and a sham.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, following me will probably be as many as 40 or more of my colleagues on the other side. Many of them will use terms like "ramming," and "the American people." I don't know what part of discussing a matter for the greater portion of the last 14 months that people do not understand.

I also get a little tired of hearing my colleagues talk about socialism. And I would ask the American people if socialism, as you understand it, is so bad when government acts than perhaps it is. Some of my colleagues believe we should eliminate Medicare. Let's eliminate Medicaid. Let's eliminate the Social Security safety net. Let's eliminate the Centers for Disease Control. Let's eliminate the National Institutes of Health. All of these are government-run programs.

In the greatest country in the world, it is morally wrong for millions of our fellow Americans to not have affordable, portable health care. We all should be willing to share in order to help the least of us.

□ 1400

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LoBIONDO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LoBIONDO. Madam Speaker, we are all asking ourselves, What do the American people want to see from us with health care? They want to see health care more affordable, more accessible.

There are ways to do that in a bipartisan manner that we can agree on: buying health care across State lines, eliminating defensive medicine practices, preexisting conditions. Why aren't we doing it? That is the question America is asking. That is why America is upset.

My colleagues are asking us, me, whose side are we on? Unabashedly, on the side of my constituents, on the side of my health care providers, my doctors on Main Street, my hospitals on Main Street, my nurses on Main Street, who are the front line in providing health care, who don't want any part of this monstrosity, for a good reason. They and our constituents understand this is not the right way for America to go.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, after so many on both sides of the aisle have spoken, it is perhaps hard to find something new to talk about. I will endeavor to do so.

Madam Speaker, President Obama has said the American people deserve the same high quality health care as Members of Congress have. Michelle Obama said the same thing. Speaker PELOSI said the same thing. HARRY REID said the same thing. As a matter of fact, virtually everybody in the Democratic caucus in leadership has said that.

Then why is it H.R. 3438, a simple, seven-page bill that gives every member of America the opportunity to have the same high quality health care that we have as Congress is being ignored? Why is it it doesn't even exist in the Democrats' comprehensive health care bill? Thousands of pages, and yet it doesn't give you exactly what they say they want to give you.

On top of that, who is beholden to the insurance companies? More than 50 percent of American dollars are insured by the Federal Government already. It is Medicare. It is Medicaid that have, in many cases, been driving up the cost of health care, and yet this bill has no real reform for Federal health care.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CASSIDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Speaker, I am a physician who has treated the uninsured in a teaching hospital for the last 20 years and, indeed, not just the uninsured, but oftentimes the people who have Medicaid. So I applaud the President and my Democratic colleagues because they want to lower costs and expand access to quality care.

On the other hand, where we greatly differ is, as my colleague just said, he is quite content with giving Medicaid to more and more people.

Now, it ignores the fact that it is bankrupting the States. It ignores the fact that right now I treat patients who have Medicaid in a public hospital because they can't be seen in a private place. And, it ignores an article in The New York Times which points out that, as Medicaid payments shrink, patients and doctors lose. In this case, a woman with cancer has lost because payments are so low for Medicaid that no longer can she find a provider who can afford to treat her.

So we do differ. I do not want to give Medicaid to everybody. I want to strengthen the private insurance market and allow those with preexisting conditions to have the same health care we have, not lose their health care because of a government program.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, for more than 1 year, Congress and the administration have failed to make health care reform a reality.

The 2,700-page bill, which can only pass through convoluted, inside-the-Beltway shenanigans, has over \$500 billion in tax increases, not to mention the \$500 billion in Medicare cuts that come with that increase, which jeopardizes million of seniors' existing health care coverage. And this bill includes millions of dollars in cuts to home health care for the elderly, millions of dollars in cuts for Alzheimer's programs, millions of dollars in cuts for food for seniors programs.

This bill makes no sense for America's families, no sense for America's seniors, and it is a fiscal time bomb for future generations.

I do not want to leave a legacy of debt to my granddaughter, Morgan Elizabeth.

In Congress' scramble to get any kind of bill passed, regardless of its cost or impact, they have taken the wrong approach. We can do better.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, this week Speaker PELOSI and the House Democrats are trying to ram through one of the most ill-conceived

pieces of legislation of all time, and they are considering not allowing Members an up-or-down vote on the bill.

One House Democrat recently said, "I don't need to see my colleagues vote for the Senate bill in the House. We don't like the Senate bill. Why should we be forced to do that?" Good question.

This attitude perfectly sums up the Democrats' push to have Washington bureaucrats take over our health care system. President Obama and the Democratic leadership don't think the rules apply to them.

First, the House Democrats had to twist arms enough to get Members to vote for their bill despite a 40-vote majority. Then, Senate Democrats had to give a sweetheart deal to Senators from Louisiana, Nebraska, Florida, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and so on. Now the House Democrats are preparing to pass this legislation without even having an up-or-down vote.

It is no wonder the American people oppose this bill by such a wide margin. They feel like they are being duped by the Democratic leadership.

It is time to reject this Democratic health care and start over.

EMPOWERMENT

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, Article I, section 7 of the Constitution states, "The votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for or against this bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively."

So why is Speaker NANCY PELOSI trying to prevent Congress from doing the job of voting yeas or nays on the most important piece of legislation that will probably face this Congress?

Just yesterday, when she was talking about the Slaughter solution, she said, "But I like it, because people don't have to vote on the Senate bill."

Well, Madam Speaker, if this bill is so bad, why are you trying to jam it down the American people's throat? Shame on you, Madam Speaker, that you would use a process to circumvent the very foundation of this Nation, which is the United States Constitution.

I encourage my colleagues to take a gut check here and look across the aisle and look at their citizens across the country. We have young people from all over America here. Look them in the eye and say, "You know what? We are going to bring the most important piece of legislation to this floor. We are not going to actually make our Members have to take a vote on it, but you will be paying for it for the rest of your life."

Madam Speaker, that is not the way we should do business, and you should be ashamed.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, by now, we all know the many flaws with the health care bill that is going to be rammed through this House, and there certainly are many.

It cuts Medicare by one-half trillion dollars. It raises taxes, jeopardizes patient access to health care, and puts an unelected bureaucrat, or many bureaucrats, in charge of your health care.

I want to tell a brief story about something that happened to me this weekend.

I was in a local drugstore with a friend of mine waiting for a prescription, and a woman came up to me and she said, Are you GINNY BROWN-WAITE? And I said, Yes, ma'am. And she said, I want to talk to you about the health care bill.

She proceeded to tell me, she said, I am about to lose my job, which means I will lose my health care. And I thought I knew what she was next going to say, and she totally shocked me. She pointed to her daughter, who she told me was 9 years old, and she said, But I don't want you to vote for that bill, Congresswoman, because I don't want this child and her children paying for an out-of-control health care system in America.

I believe that she really speaks the way most Americans believe.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MCKEON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the majority's attempt to have the Federal Government take over the national health care system. This has been a yearlong debate, and it is clear that the American public does not want this bill. People are justifiably outraged at the contempt the majority has shown to them.

Everything my constituents dislike is still in the majority's health care bill: billions in new taxes on small businesses and families, over \$1 trillion in new Federal spending, a health care czar to make health care decisions for families, a Federal mandate to buy health insurance, hundreds of billions in Medicare cuts, expanding access to abortion, and sleazy backroom deals.

If this is the panacea that the majority claims it is, then why is it that they are refusing to allow a straight up-or-down vote? Do you think you can fool them with procedural gimmicks such as deeming a bill passed without actually voting on it? I don't think so, and I think it is shameful to try.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GERLACH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, as I stand here today, congressional Democrat leadership has yet to finalize or publish the so-called fix-it bill that will ultimately be the basis to gather the 216 votes necessary to pass health care reform, and they certainly haven't said how much it is going to cost; yet Democrat after Democrat has gotten up here today saying that they are for this legislation.

So think about it. How can you be for a bill that is not yet written, not yet finalized, not yet published, and for which no one knows how much it is going to cost? The answer is simple. It is really not about how much it costs or how many people it will cover; it is about control, government control over who is going to make health care decisions in this country. And that is exactly what the American people are rejecting.

Madam Speaker, the swamp isn't being drained through this process; it apparently is just getting deeper and wider.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Wake up, America. The Speaker is trying to pass the health care bill without letting America see it first. In fact, she said, "I have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it." She is also shooting for a voteless passage, and that is unconstitutional.

Well, I can tell my Democrat colleagues what is in it. The health care bill is littered full of sweetheart deals, one after another, from the Louisiana purchase to the Cornhusker kickback. What is another term for hustling votes? Buying them.

The American people are fed up with secret backroom deals in smoke-filled rooms. It is no wonder all Americans are clear in their opposition to what they have seen, read, and heard on health care.

Bring the real Senate bill to the floor for an honest up-or-down vote. These sneaky shenanigans defy common sense, and the American people want, need, and deserve better.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MAFFEI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, this morning I stood at the American Cancer Society in my district and announced that I will support the President's historic reform effort. I am supporting it because right now sky-

rocketing health care costs aren't just crippling the U.S. economy; they are emptying pocketbooks in central and western New York.

Regular, middle class people can't afford the health care they need. Insurance companies have denied care. Kids are graduating from college and they can't find care. People with life-threatening conditions need to hold bake sales and bowl-a-thons in order to pay their health care bills. Families are going bankrupt not because they were irresponsible, but because they trusted their health insurance companies.

Now, experts and nonpartisan organizations say that this bill will save money. I believe that the cost-savers in this bill will save money, but I know that doing nothing will bankrupt our country and our families and our small businesses.

I stood this morning with two remarkable women from my district. One had insurance and one did not. They are both battling cancer. For them, this debate isn't about partisan politics; it is about their lives. They strongly support this effort, and so do I.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, in 2017, Medicare goes insolvent. It goes broke in 2017. So do the Democrats have a plan to reform and save Medicare? No. The Democrats' plan actually raids one-half trillion dollars from Medicare to create a massive new government-controlled health care program.

So even though the Speaker is writing this bill behind closed doors in secret, Madam Speaker, the American people, particularly senior citizens, are not being fooled. They oppose this massive bill that will nationalize health care and that will raid one-half trillion dollars from Medicare. They oppose it, and so should we.

□ 1415

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this bill is based on so many fictions, it should not be passed. One is that we're going to do a rule and then that is going to be self-perpetuating. And that's going to pass the bill. That's a fiction. It ought to be an up-or-down vote on this bill. And if you read the very basics on this bill from the Senate, it says, Resolved, the bill from the House of Representatives, H.R. 3590, entitled: An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces.

We're going to pass this on the backs of the Armed Forces. This should not

be passed by anyone unless they eat it. If they eat it, then I'm in favor of them passing it. Otherwise, don't pass it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam Speaker, higher premiums, higher taxes, and cutting Medicare is not health care reform. Republicans care about health care, but we don't care for this bill. Unfortunately, the White House and congressional Democrats are still insisting on their massive, 2,700-plus page bill that includes higher premiums, \$500 billion in higher taxes, and \$500 billion in cuts to seniors' Medicare. That is not reform.

There is a reason why Congress has been debating this for a year. The reason the majority is having such trouble securing passage is because Americans have made it abundantly clear that they don't like this bill either. I want to make something clear: killing the Democrat plan for a government health care takeover does not kill the health care debate. It simply allows us to start from scratch and focus on real solutions that will lower the cost of health care for small businesses and families across this Nation. Stop this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Isn't this troubling? Eight out of ten Americans now believe Congress governs without the consent of the governed. The Democratic Congress and White House simply aren't listening. Americans oppose this \$2 trillion takeover of health care, but Democrats are ramming it through over the public's objection. Americans oppose the tax increases, mandates, deficits, Medicare cuts, and government interference in their most intimate health care decisions, but House Democrats arrogantly claim they know what's best for you.

Americans want open, honest government. Democrats are cutting backroom deals, pressing Members of Congress, proclaiming bills passed without a vote of the House—all to circumvent the will of the American people. Americans want Washington to start over immediately; to go back to the basics, to have a step-by-step bipartisan bill that focuses first on lowering health care cost. So, Madam Speaker, why aren't you listening? But know this: A Congress that governs in secrecy and arrogance will not govern long. The American people will see to that.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. PLATTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PLATTS. Everyone agrees that the status quo in health care is unacceptable, but the proposed health care reform legislation is also unacceptable. Two of the greatest gifts that my parents gave my four brothers and sisters and I was a solid foundation in the ideals of common sense and right versus wrong. This health care bill fails to pass both of these principles. Common sense tells us that a health care bill that increases health care costs by over a trillion dollars is wrong; that raises taxes by over \$500 billion is wrong; that cuts Medicare by \$500 billion is wrong; that forces millions of Americans off of private insurance into a government-run health care plan is wrong; and a plan that allows taxpayer funds to be used for abortion services is wrong.

A simple application of the "right versus wrong" test tells us that seeking to pass such a monumental piece of legislation by deeming it passed without an up-or-down vote is wrong. Basic principles—common sense, right versus wrong. This proposal fails both of those very important principles. My mom and dad got it right. These matter.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, Article I, section 5 of the United States Constitution states, "the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal." This is to ensure that important pieces of legislation, like the one before us this week, are given a clear up-or-down vote. Yet here we stand today with the possibility that a massive, trillion-dollar government takeover of our health care system would actually not be voted on in this Chamber. Not only does this violate the spirit of fairness within the rules of the House and the confidence entrusted in us by our constituents, it potentially violates our Constitution. Legislative gymnastics should not be used to pass a bill of this magnitude that will impact the life of every American. Change is needed within our health care system. We can all agree on that. But in an effort to pass a health care bill—any bill—this congressional majority has lost their way.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HELLER. Another day, another missed opportunity. Nevada's unemployment rate is at 13 percent. So you have to ask the question: Where are the jobs? I do tele-town hall meetings weekly in my district. I survey thousands. The question asked is: What should be the priority of this Congress? Should it be jobs and the economy or

should it be health care? Over 80 percent say we should be concentrating on jobs and the economy. Instead, the majority leadership wants me to vote for the Louisiana purchase or the Cornhusker kickback or the Gator-aid. The list goes on and on.

Despite the majority's effort to hide this vote, the American people will not be fooled. The American people know the purpose of this health care bill is to make sure all Americans have the same bad health care. I encourage my colleagues to listen to the American people, create bipartisan health care reform, and get Americans back to work.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, I'm astounded by the Democrats' blatant abuse of the House rules established in our Constitution by entertaining the possibility of what is known as the Slaughter rule. If they choose to deem the Senate health care bill law under this self-executing rule, without a traditional up-or-down vote on the actual text, they will strip the American people of their right to checks and balances in a bicameral Congress. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly believe that this health care bill will solve the Nation's health care problems, then why are they afraid to go on the record and put their names on it?

Like most Americans, I am disillusioned with this Congress. We need to go back to the drawing board and focus on reducing health care costs, where constitutional, and not by creating a new entitlement in a backroom deal.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to speak out on the Democrats' proposed "Slaughter solution." This is a sleight-of-hand with an unconstitutional move to avoid a true vote. Article I, section 7 of the Constitution reads, Every bill shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate before it is presented to the President of the United States.

With the Slaughter solution, leadership is attempting to manipulate the rules to circumvent this fundamental constitutional requirement. In the Senate, they have a bill there with so many special deals—taxes on insurance, coverage for abortion—even they cannot pass it for a second time. And so Democrat leadership here in the House tried to avoid a traditional up-or-down vote. The Supreme Court has even spoken on this and said a bill must contain the exact text before it is approved in one House and then the other—precisely the same text.

Madam Speaker, if we ignore the basic requirements of the Constitution, whether by disregarding procedural restraints or overstepping our congressional authority by dictating people's health insurance, we will descend from the freedom of democracy toward the tyranny of a dictatorship.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Medicare will be expanded. Medicaid will be expanded to allow more people to be insured. Our children will have more health insurance. It will be a major change for America—a positive change. It is interesting that every time America makes a historic and catastrophic change for the better, there are large voices of opposition—confused voices; voices without the facts. I'm reminded of the history of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. They did not pass with large margins. The Dixiecrats raised their voices in opposition. Africans Americans, Negroes, should be second-class citizens forever.

It is time now for the courageous to recognize that Americans cannot be second class and third class in the climate of needing health insurance. That they must be able to go to hospitals and not be kicked out; that they must be able to get insurance without saying you have a preexisting disease; that women cannot be discriminated against.

Where's the courage to stand up as we did in the time when African Americans needed their freedom? It is now time to free others who do not have health insurance. Do you have the courage to make these hard decisions when others are chatting away, saying the wrong thing? It is time to pass health care reform. I want to stand with the courageous on behalf of the American people.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, it is very difficult to criticize a bill that is still being put together behind closed doors. But we do know that it is more about consolidation of power in Washington than about real health reform for the American people. We also know that a poor process always equals poor public policy, and the procedural shenanigans being proposed by the Speaker and Democratic leaders to slip this past the American people make all of Lucy Ricardo's schemes to be a part of Ricky's show look like clear and logical plans of action. This also would be a comedy if it wasn't such a tragedy for the American people.

Madam Speaker, my State has already instituted real health care solu-

tions that deal with our demographics and give people options in the State of Utah. All of our efforts will be destroyed if this one-size-fits-all, trillion-dollar tragedy is actually passed here on the House floor.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TERRY. There will be no straight up-and-down vote on a health care bill. Instead, the leadership has chosen a procedural trick to insert the Senate bill into a rule deeming the Senate bill passed. So if you vote for the rule, you are voting for the Cornhusker kickback, the Louisiana purchase, and language that allows funds to flow to abortions. What won't be in this bill is the Terry bill or amendment that allows people to join the same health care plans that we have as Members of Congress. Why? Because it's not controlled by the government and its bureaucrats.

Yes, this is about government control, where bureaucrats and Congress will be in control of your health care. And somehow the leadership and authors of these tricks in this bill wonder why the American people don't want this bill.

□ 1430

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, to paraphrase James Agee, "In every child who is born, under no matter what circumstances, and of no matter what parents, the potentiality of the entire human race is born all over again." The Democrats say compassion is the fundamental motivation behind this government takeover bill. But if compassion was the motivation, Madam Speaker, Democrat leadership would not be so doggedly determined to include the increased taxpayer-funded murder of little unborn children in this bill. Nothing so completely destroys the notion that this bill is about compassion than the arrogant disenfranchisement of those who are helpless and have no voice. It is an unspeakable disgrace.

Madam Speaker, it is obvious that Democrats are determined to ram this bill down the throats of the American people using the so-called Slaughter solution, a shameless political gimmick that would avoid even an up-or-down vote on the bill. But if they do, Madam Speaker, the world will know that it was never about compassion, and Democrats will find that they have dangerously underestimated the American people.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, later this week the Speaker is going to ask the House to take the final vote on health care reform, including the Senate health care bill. The Senate bill contains such rarified legislative compromises as the Cornhusker kickback, the Louisiana purchase, and Gator aid, and for the first time ever, it allows for Federal funding for abortions. Nevertheless, the Speaker has asked us to vote on it. I understand my Democratic colleagues are being assured that the Senate will take up the bill of fixes if the House will simply just pass their underlying reform bill.

I offer a word of caution to my friends on the other side of the aisle: once you pass their bill, there is not a guarantee that can be made that will force the Senate Democrats to take up your fixed bill and pass it. The bill that passed out of the Senate satisfies 59 sitting Senators, all of whom voted for it. The compromise that will pass out of this House will please far fewer. Simple logic tells us that the Senate Democrats do not have a real and abiding interest in bailing out House Democrats for having passed the Senate bill. Of course, simple logic has never really been a part of this debate.

Madam Speaker, my Democratic colleagues are playing a game of chicken with the United States Senate. In the end, the President might just go ahead and sign this Senate bill into law, along with the Cornhusker kickback, Louisiana purchase, Gator aid and abortion funding, and every other twisted deal jumbled into this mess.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, of this massive almost 3,000-page bill, there is not one thing that lowers cost; not one. A recent Heritage Foundation article focused on the fact that the health care system is fraught with perverse economic incentives that generate artificially high and rapidly increasing spending. This system does nothing to incentivize the doctor, the patient or the insurance company, let alone the Federal Government, to spend the health care dollars efficiently. However, I'm not suggesting that patients have to bear higher out-of-pocket costs. By this, the doctor and the patient must be reengaged, however, with the cost of their care. And how can we do that?

One amendment that we have tried to get into this bill a number of times and has failed is a robust system of health savings accounts for all. This way, we get to have our cake and eat it too. By that I mean that a portion of

the insurance premiums should be put into a special medical spending account for those on all government and private insurance programs who would, in turn, be able to use tax-free funds for discretionary health care purchases. This would be the first step in turning patients into savvy health care consumers. As they save money for themselves, they will save it for the health care system at large, thus bending the cost curve downward.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, yesterday I held a town hall in Statesville, North Carolina, to hear from my constituents about health care reform. One thing was abundantly clear: they do not want this bill, and they're sick and tired of the backroom deals and provisions that have characterized this process. They wanted health care reform, but they were vehemently opposed to the Senate bill.

My constituents are asking me, if this is such a wonderful bill, why is the majority resorting to tricks and sleight of hand to get it passed? If this bill is so great, why not have a regular vote? The answer is simple: this is not a bill the American people want. Some Members acknowledge that.

Madam Speaker, we should listen to the American people. We should take an incremental approach to health care reform that the American people can support.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROSKAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, as we are here today on the House floor, at this very moment the Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives is smiling and dialing. They are calling Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle, cajoling them and coaxing them and urging them to do the equivalent of really political bungee jumping, but they don't know how long the cord is. They are saying, You be the first one to jump off. We're going to vote for this Senate bill, and you are going to trust in the Senate to take it up and fix it. Or alternatively, even worse, we're not going to have a final vote on this bill.

Can you imagine a process that is this manipulated that is at this high stakes, literally the Federal Government taking over one-sixth of the economy really in the twinkling of an eye? And it is as if the Democratic leaders are telling the American public, Oh, look, we have got a wonderful plan for your life. You are just going to love it. We are going to vote on it, and then we'll let you read it.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. The American public demands that we do better, to vote "no" and start over.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to not only the Democrats' health care proposal but to the outrageous process by which the majority intends to ram this bill through the House while denying Members of Congress an up-or-down vote on the bill. This morning's Cincinnati Enquirer declared what Americans all over this country are saying: "This disgusting process, which Democrats brazenly wish to bring to conclusion this week, is being done with little regard for the opinions of a clear majority of Americans who, while they may believe health care reform is necessary, think this particular approach will take our Nation down the wrong economic path."

American families want health care reform that will expand access and choices and decrease costs. The Democrats' health care bill includes tax increases, Medicare cuts, job-killing mandates, and higher premiums. This bill is nothing more than the same government-run insurance mandates and taxes the American people have overwhelmingly rejected. This bill must be killed. We must start over.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, when I was driving into work last Friday, I heard the Governor of Arizona on the news saying that her State already faces its biggest deficit ever, over \$3 billion. She said they had calculated that the health care bill would cost an additional \$4 billion that they simply do not have.

Because Tennessee already covers more than most States, our Democratic Governor, nonetheless, said it would cost out State from \$750 million up to \$3 billion more. Most States are in far worse shape than Tennessee or Arizona, yet much of this bill is paid for by forcing millions more onto State and Medicaid rolls. In yesterday's Washington Post, columnist Robert Samuelson said the bill "evades health care's major problems and would worsen the budget outlook." He wrote that "It's a big new spending program when government hasn't paid for the spending programs it already has."

Madam Speaker, even if this program were the greatest thing since sliced bread, the fact is that we simply cannot afford it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HARPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, late last night, the House Budget Committee approved the reconciliation shell bill with two Democratic Members joining all Republicans in opposing this enormous entitlement expansion, and we still do not know what changes the Speaker will bring forward.

The President has asked Congress to hold an up-or-down vote on the Senate's so-called health care reform proposal. Let's have that vote. The President has argued the Democrats need courage to pass this one-size-fits-all government takeover of health care. But where's the courage in hiding behind procedural chaos like the Slaughter solution? No matter what anyone says, a "yes" vote on the reconciliation bill is a vote for the Senate's flawed trillion-dollar bill containing kickbacks, like the Cornhusker kickback and the Louisiana purchase, and allows for Federal funding for abortion.

The bottom line is this health care bill is so bad that the Democrats have to resort to trickery. I will not support a bill that will increase families' insurance premiums and force hundreds of millions of dollars in unfunded mandates to my home State of Mississippi. I will not support this abusive use of the reconciliation process, and I will not support the bogus procedures that are being used to hide from the American people. I urge you to oppose this legislation.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, this year I replaced town hall meetings in my district with listening sessions. I go to hear what my constituents have to teach me and to teach this body. They want us to know that the process matters to them. Some of my colleagues like to say that it doesn't make any difference, but my constituents know that when legislation is negotiated in the backroom, that America loses. They know that in the back rooms, stimulus bills turn into pork bills, bailout bills turn into just more debt, and energy bills turn into taxes.

Today, hundreds of Americans are walking the halls of this building, asking us to stop this outrageous government takeover of health care and take health reform step by step and structure a system that lets them out of this broken system, not locks them into it permanently. I hear them, Madam Speaker, and I certainly hope that this Chamber hears them.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I'm hearing loud and clear from people of America's First District in Virginia that this health care bill before us will not reduce costs, will not increase access, and is full of sweetheart, backroom deals that they find highly objectionable and that now we are proposing to put this bill through without having to directly vote on the bill. That also makes them mad.

Let me tell you what they're saying. Jimmy from Yorktown says, "We are very concerned with the direction congressional leadership is taking health care reform. It is apparent Congress is not listening to the American public. We understand the need to address health care reform. However, Congress must include fiscal responsibility in any reform legislation. Congress needs to listen to the American voter and taxpayer instead of holding our views in contempt."

There are many other people from the First District that have very similar views. I urge my colleagues to vote "no." Let's listen to the American people, listen to their concerns, and do the right thing.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, one day after the health care summit at the Blair House, Peggy Noonan wrote in *The Wall Street Journal*, and I quote: What the meeting made clear is what the Democrats are going to do, not step back and save the moderates of their party, but attempt to bully a bill through the Congress. This is boorish of them, and they will suffer for it."

Indeed, Madam Speaker, I think the Democrats will get slaughtered for it. But, unfortunately, the collateral damage is to the health of the American people. I ask all my colleagues, join with me and my constituents in the 11th Congressional District of Georgia and vote "no" on this rule and this so-called deeming legislation.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, if my previous colleague thought that the Democrats were going to get slaughtered for passing this bill, a few of them would cut out of the herd and help pass it. But that's absolutely not the case. This year-long debate and the bipartisan health care meeting show that Democrats and Republicans do agree in some areas. Both agree that

the status quo isn't working for Americans; both agree that waste, fraud and abuse should be removed from the system; both agree that we should invest in prevention and wellness.

The bill has incorporated several Republican ideas into its proposal, but Democrats and Republicans have a profound disagreement on the proper oversight on insurance companies. We believe that insurance companies need to be held accountable with minimum commensurate standards to help keep premiums and industry abuses down. Republicans believe that insurance companies should have a freer hand and should be free to raise rates and reduce, and even eliminate, coverage. We believe that the most effective way to reduce premiums for all Americans and businesses, large and small, and the only way to cover all people with pre-existing conditions is to make sure that everyone is in the insurance system. Republicans disagree, and their plan will not outlaw discrimination against people with preexisting conditions. Those are profound differences, Madam Speaker, and that's why we need health care reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my utter disbelief and disappointment at the path the Democrat leadership has chosen for health care reform. Never, ever in my 14 years of legislating have I ever been asked to vote for a bill that will "be fixed later." We don't even know what this bill costs—well, in excess of \$1 trillion—or what backroom deals will wind up being in this bill after the vote. It is an absolute affront to the integrity of this Congress that we are being asked to put a signature on the bottom of a blank page.

Now, we've all seen team building exercises where one person stands blindfolded on the edge of a table and is asked to fall back into the arms of their colleagues. Well, that's what the Speaker is asking this Congress to do, to fall backwards from this precipice with the promise that all will be well. My constituents deserve more than a mere promise of trust. We should not be asked to be voting on a bill that will affect one-sixth of our economy and touch every single American's life without knowing what is in the bill.

Well, the Speaker knows what's in the bill, and she doesn't want anybody to vote on it. Americans deserve health reform, but they deserve it the right way.

□ 1445

THE DEFINITION OF COURAGE

(Mr. LATOURETTE asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States was in beautiful Strongsville, Ohio, and the biggest applause line he got was when he said, We need courage. We need courage to have an up-or-down vote on the health care bill.

Now, I'm not a big fan of the health care bill, but I thought, My, that's pretty brave. And I looked up "courage": mental or moral strength to venture, persevere, withstand danger, fear, or difficulty. So good for the President; he's standing up for his principles.

Well, imagine my surprise when I padded out in my jammies this morning and got *The Washington Post*, and the headline on the top of the fold is "Pelosi may try to pass health bill without vote." And I said, No, she didn't. But, I thought, perhaps sometimes newspapers are misleading and the headline might not describe the story. But no, sadly, this is the story.

So it's not courage that we're going to have here. So I went a little further in the dictionary. "Cowardly," that fits. "Craven," that fits. You go a little into the Ds; "deceptive," that's appropriate. Go a little bit further, "gutless," into the Gs. Right. "Spineless," under the Ss. And you can go all the way to the Ys, "yellow-bellied."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery, that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Back when Thomas Jefferson did the first Louisiana Purchase, he got all parts of 13 States for, what's in inflation-adjusted dollars, \$150 million today. When the Senate health care bill passed, it cost \$300 million to just get and buy one vote. Who knows what this week is going to cost the American taxpayers.

We've also seen the outrage of how they propose to pass this bill. Over in the Senate, rather than the deliberative body going through in what's a takeover of 17 percent of the American economy, they're going to go through and try to jam it with a majority plus the Vice President, or one, whatever they need.

Now we have the Slaughter rule in the House, where they're going to try not to even have an up-or-down vote. They're not even going to try to get 51 percent or 50 percent plus the Speaker. They're going to deem it passed.

Do they really think the American people are going to buy this unconstitutional fraud?

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, look, I'm surprised when I go home. My constituents will tell me unequivocally that they're in favor of health care reform, but they're not in favor of this plan. And yet I come to Washington, and they say, if you're in favor of health care reform, you have to buy into this sham of a health care bill. Well, my constituents know what a sham is and, unfortunately, it's this Senate bill that the House is going to be voting on.

Then I read headlines that the Speaker of the House doesn't actually want a vote on the Senate bill, and I recall the basics of parliamentary procedure that require the House to vote on the exact same bill the Senate does before it can be signed by the President to be enacted into law. So the Democrats are just trying to pull a fast one on the American people.

The American people know that this is a bad deal. According to the Congressional Budget Office, run by a Democrat, they're right to be worried, because premiums will go up between 10 and 13 percent under this plan. That means \$2,100 more for the average family in America in health care expenses. It's a wrong plan, and we should oppose it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, this past weekend I visited with four of my six counties in North Carolina—Moore, Guilford, Davidson, and Rowan counties—hundreds of people, and without exception, no one spoke in favor of this bill. Increased taxes, they said to me, increased costs. The heavy-handed way in which it's been administered, as if to say, By golly, this is the bill you're going to get whether you like it or not.

Madam Speaker, this proposal is a train wreck waiting to occur. We need no train wrecks.

I will admit that some attention needs to be directed to the delivery of health care in this Nation, but this is not the appropriate vehicle to deliver it. We need to scrap this bill and start anew with a sound proposal.

PASSING THE HEALTH CARE BILL WITHOUT A VOTE

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, to protect Members from voting on the Senate health care bill, Democrats are using a self-enacting rule to deem that bill passed by the House.

As Speaker PELOSI said, "It's more insider and process-oriented than most people want to know. But I like it because people don't have to vote on the Senate bill."

Huh?

This is the same Speaker who stated, "We have to pass the bill so you can see what's in it." So that you can see what's in it.

Huh?

They are distorting the Rules Committee procedures and the reconciliation process to ram through a health care bill. Where is the transparency that Speaker PELOSI talked about?

Huh?

Last year, the House was passing bills without reading them. This year, they are passing bills without voting on them.

The Democrats desire passage of a health care bill in the darkness of a self-enacting rule. It's an affront to the constitutional powers of Congress and every voter in this country.

DEMOCRAT HEALTH PLAN IS THE WRONG PRESCRIPTION FOR AMERICA

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, with millions of phone calls, emails and personal visits, the American people have made it clear to Congress that they want health care reform that lowers costs, not a government takeover of their health care system.

I support reforms that will lower the cost of health care and increase choices for Americans, but the fact is that the bills being pushed through Congress won't achieve these goals. They, instead, lead to higher spending and more government control.

Instead of listening to the American people, Democrats in Congress have made it clear that they will do whatever it takes to have their trillion dollar health care proposal become law. These bills making their way through Congress ignore the clear desire of Americans to scrap the government takeover of health care, and they ignore the clear desire of Americans to start over again.

Congress must, instead, focus on commonsense solutions that reduce costs, increase choices, and help more Americans afford the coverage they deserve.

The bottom line, Madam Speaker, is that Congress needs to start over on a new bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, when we picked up the headlines of The Washington Post today, it says, "Pelosi may try to pass health bill without vote." And through nothing more than budgetary gimmicks, like counting half a trillion dollars reserved for Medicare twice, the Speaker claims it's going to pencil out.

I think the American people know better. They understand that you cannot create a massive new entitlement program behind closed doors and expect our dire financial situation, our dire fiscal predicament in this country to do anything except compound.

Instead of addressing the actual drivers of rising health care costs, like escalating legal liability cost, and structural flaws in the way insurance is regulated, this bill compounds the problem and shifts the cost curve up, not down.

Faced with trillion-dollar deficits as far as the eye can see, now is the time to take a step back and look for incremental reforms that can increase affordability for millions of Americans without saddling future generations with this unpayable tab.

The American people know that when so-called health care reform includes tax hikes, less freedom and more government control, it's a government takeover of health care.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, we are hearing about the problems with this health care bill, from its failure to address the real cost drivers, as well as its subversion of the democratic process. But here's another problem. The Speaker of the House, on Monday, asserted that the bill before us is "about health care, health insurance reform. It's not about abortion."

Now for the reality. The bill before us would permit the Federal Government to provide subsidies to insurance plans that cover abortion, oversee State plans that cover elective abortions, and allow Federal officials to mandate that private plans cover abortions. It is replete with abortion.

The American people have spoken, and they do not want their taxpayer dollars entangled in the provision of abortion. Abortion is not health care, and no American should be forced to pay for it.

We should be supporting those in vulnerable circumstances. Abortion is so often the result of abandonment. Women deserve better. But true health care reform must be life-affirming. I will not support this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, as the vote on health insurance reform approaches, I've become increasingly troubled at the things that this bill fails to do.

Despite claims to the contrary, the Democrat bill fails to decrease health care costs. We keep hearing about how people are being cost out of the market; they can't afford their health care, but it does not decrease health care costs. In fact, the bill would increase the cost of health care in the form of higher premiums and exorbitant new taxes on families. Furthermore, it will not prevent funds from going to illegal aliens or abortions. So that's what it doesn't do.

What does it do? Well, this legislation will make sure the American people are more addicted to socialism because we will be more dependent on the Federal bureaucracy. What it will do is create a \$1 trillion new program, even when we can't afford the current programs.

Well, what we need to do is to make sure that we come up with a list of reforms that is a bipartisan list. The Democrats have actually ignored what Republicans have offered to reform the system in order to transform it. Well, they're transforming it by making backroom deals. That's not what the American people want.

Let's come forward with what we believe in and how to make the system better and work together. But we have to start by voting "no" on this legislation.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents who tell me time and time again that they do not want a government-run health care plan. In spite of all this protest, Democrats are seeking to jam the bill down the taxpayers' throats through a convoluted legislative rule known as the Slaughter solution. This scheme allows a vote on a rule that would deem the Senate version of the health care bill to be passed without bringing the actual bill up for a vote.

Constituents send their Members of Congress to Washington to represent their interests through votes. The Slaughter House rule would violate our constitutional pledge to protect and defend the Constitution.

To pass a bill of this magnitude through a procedural gimmick like the Slaughter House rule would be a cowardly cover-up. What exactly is the majority afraid of? Why are they trying to hide their vote?

The American people deserve an open and honest vote.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, you know, for the better part of a year, we have devoted the lion's share of our attention to health care reform, and this is where we are today. From the Speaker of the House, "We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what's in it." That's simply unbelievable, and it's wrong.

You know, I have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to develop proposals that will lower costs, expand access, and improve quality. I regret very much where we are today in terms of both the policy and the process.

Policywise, there is a lot we don't know. We haven't seen this reconciliation fix-it bill. We don't have a score from the CBO. We're talking about 1/6 of our American economy, but we haven't seen it yet.

Let's talk about what we do know, the bill that we have seen, the Senate health care bill. This bill will increase taxes by more than a half a trillion dollars. It will slash Medicare by nearly a half a trillion dollars, all to create a \$1 trillion entitlement program. Families who purchase coverage in the individual market will see an average increase in their premium of \$2,300.

This is not the reform the American people want.

Unbelievably, the process is even worse than the policy. In the coming days, the powerful Rules Committee will meet up there in that room on the third floor and, according to reports, it will use an arrogant manipulation of our legislative process.

I say defeat this bill. The American people deserve better.

□ 1500

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LUJÁN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my friends on the other side of the aisle some questions: Why do you want to let health insurance companies deny people because of pre-existing conditions? Why do you want people to lose their coverage if they lose their jobs? Why do you want to let insurance companies drop people when they get sick?

There is a simple choice. Either you want to stand up for the American people or you want to stand up for insurance companies. It has been clear over the last year that my friends on the other side of the aisle would rather stand up for health insurance companies. They would rather let insurance companies raise their rates by 25 percent like they did in my State of New Mexico. They would rather let families' premiums double by 2020, increasing from \$12,100 to \$25,600. They would rather let employer premiums increase by 98 percent by 2020.

This reform bill isn't perfect, but it stops insurance companies from denying people for preexisting conditions, it provides more choice, it lowers costs, it stops insurance companies from dropping people who are sick, it helps small businesses by giving them tax credits, and it helps seniors by making prescription drugs more affordable.

It's time to act. It's time to reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMP. Americans do not want a government takeover of health care. They do not want a 2,000-page bill that puts Federal bureaucrats in charge of their personal health care decisions. They do not want a half-a-trillion-dollar cut to Medicare to fund a new entitlement program. And they do not want a half-a-trillion-dollar increase in taxes, or \$1 trillion in new Federal spending. They do not want the back room deals that were cut to buy off special interests. And they certainly do not want a health care bill that will increase the cost of their health insurance.

But that is exactly what the Democrat bill does. And that is exactly what the Democrats are trying to cram through Congress this week. If the majority wants to pass this bill, they ought to have the guts to hold an up-or-down vote and not try to hide from the American people what is really being voted on.

Madam Speaker, Americans do not want and can't afford this bill. Let's scrap it and start over.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, process, process, process. What legislative parliamentary process are we using? It is a distraction. That is what someone talks about when they can't debate the content or they run out of lies or misdirections about the substance of an argument.

I don't think the woman from New Jersey is any more interested in our process today to guarantee that she has reliable coverage than she is concerned about what process the insurance company used to compose the letter saying that because she is sick, her coverage is rescinded. She prefers to have the guaranteed coverage.

Do you think a small businessman in New Jersey cares what process the insurance company used to arrive at a 25 percent increase in premiums? Or the process we use to limit the out-of-pocket expenses a person must spend for coverage?

Enough using procedures to stall and delay. Let's get it done, to provide consumer protections for everyone. Let's

get it done, to have caps on insurance premium increases. Let's get it done, for better health care outcomes.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HALL of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. As we enter into the most important and eventful week of the 30 years since I have been up here, I think of the consequences of the votes we will cast, both Republican and Democrat. When we passed the health bill on this very floor, the Democrats, with a 40-vote advantage on the House floor, passed H.R. 3962 with only a five-vote advantage, which showed that the outrageous health bill had been lessened in severity in the Commerce Committee and was softened up enough for the Senate to kill it.

Then a series of Senators negotiated gifts they were not entitled to, each receiving a different consideration, into being the coveted 60th vote. If we take the floor back, I would consider subpoenaing those who may have made the overtures to compare it to the law of bribery or corrupt deals. I would send the results to the Federal and State prosecutors. The bribery penalty as set out in 18 U.S. Code section 203 is imprisonment for not more than a year and a civil fine of not more than \$50,000 for each violation.

I consider offering a bribe, for a personal benefit, as worse than accepting one. Let's clean up the United States Congress and listen to our people whose only request is to take back their country.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express the concerns of Arkansas's Third District regarding health care reform. I have received an unprecedented amount of mail because the people of Arkansas aren't in favor of the legislative gymnastics and procedural tricks Speaker PELOSI is playing. It's inappropriate to play games to pass a health care reform bill Americans overwhelmingly oppose, a bill that represents 16 percent of our economy.

The administration called for an up-or-down vote with no procedural maneuvering, but Ms. PELOSI and the Rules Committee are currently in the process of bypassing this up-or-down vote. By approving this rule, the Senate bill will be deemed as passed. This is not the way our founders envisioned the government working for the people.

We owe it to Arkansans and all Americans to fight for real health care reform and at least have a real "yes" or "no" vote. How in the world do you pass a bill without voting on it?

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. LUETKEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I would like to read a few examples of some of the emails I have been receiving on the health care proposal.

From Columbia, Missouri:

"Just a note to encourage you to fight hard against this horrible health care bill."

From St. Charles, Missouri:

"Please vote 'no' on the health care reform now before the House."

From Hannibal, Missouri:

"Congressman, please vote 'no' on the Senate's health care bill. We need to scrap that plan and start over."

From Ashland, Missouri:

"Please do not vote for the health care bill."

From Huntsville, Missouri:

"I sincerely hope you do not vote for the health care bill as it now stands."

Finally, from Columbia, Missouri:

"Vote what your people want you to do, which is against this health care bill."

Madam Speaker, my constituents have listened to the debate and rejected the proposed health care bill. No, no, no, no, no. What part of "no" does the majority not understand? I am going to listen to my constituents. I am going to be voting against the health care bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to respond to what I think that the leadership is going to bring later this week. I understand that they are going to bring a vote to the floor that the President and our Speaker believe is a socialist plan—or I know it is a socialist plan for the government takeover of health care. And the Speaker wants her members to have the courage to pass this what she believes is a prescription for health care reform in America.

What it is is a prescription for disaster in our country, and it is also a prescription for disaster for the majority party. That is what I would like to address the balance of my remarks to. The majority party is being asked to vote for something that their districts and their constituents don't want. The President yesterday in a speech said that what he was hoping the Members would do is show courage for a change.

Well, I agree with the President. I hope that the Democrat Members do show courage later this week. Show courage to not be a lapdog for the leadership and the President, and show the courage to be a bulldog for their districts and their constituents who adamantly oppose this socialist takeover of government health care for our country.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I had two town hall meetings in my district on Saturday, and at both events my constituents raised this issue: How can Congress impose the most sweeping intrusion into personal health care decisions in the history of our country without a direct vote on the bill? You see, my constituents have read the Constitution, including the provision that requires both Houses to vote on a bill before it becomes a law.

If the Democrat majority attempts to impose this law without a direct vote, two things will be obvious to every American. First, that the Democrats are ashamed to cast the very up-or-down vote on the health care takeover that the President promised as recently as yesterday. And far more disturbing, they will know that the Congress has now placed itself above the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, 10 generations of Americans have defended that Constitution. Don't think for a moment that this generation will do any less.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, there is one difference between my friends over here who are speechifying against health care reform today and 50 million Americans. The difference is that the roughly 15 Americans over here all have health insurance, and it is largely paid for by the taxpayers. Fifty million Americans don't have that good fortune. In fact, that difference is shameful, that difference is immoral, and I hope to God that this House has the courage and the decency to vote to change it this week.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Health care costs are increasing at two and three times the rate of inflation. Obviously, if this continues, it will bury us. So any health care reform needs to address health care costs. There are two major cost drivers in health care. This bill is silent on one and makes the other worse.

The one that it is silent on is tort reform. Some people think the defensive medicine associated with the threat of malpractice suits may account for a fourth of all health care costs. This bill does nothing to address that. A second cost driver is administrative costs, which may again represent a fourth of all costs. This bill makes that worse by

proposing to give to poor people a policy and incur all of the health care costs associated with that policy.

We need to give poor people health care. Give the doctor, the clinic, the hospital a tax credit for giving them their health care. Then we avoid all of the administrative costs associated with that. This bill fails on both of those counts.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. With all the controversy about the health care bill, the content of it, the argument about what is in it, what is not in it, this really does boil down to a fundamental question that this Congress and this country has eluded and avoided for over 70 years, and, that is, will we have a health care system where every American is covered and where every American helps pay? Will we have a health care system where we have a common desire and need to control costs and to reform the delivery system? That is one side.

The other question is, will we have a health care system that embeds the status quo that for the past 70 years has served the interests of the insurance companies very well, increasing their profits, salaries to \$24 million, where it is a fee-for-service, volume-driven system that is absolutely burying our employers and our families under a burden of costs that we can't keep up with? That is basically the question.

Will this health care bill allow Americans to have access to health care or ensure profits again for the insurance company?

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REICHERT. Listen. Can you hear the American voices loud and clear saying, I don't want a government takeover of health care? The Democrats' latest plan is still a government takeover of health care. It includes billions of dollars in new taxes, over a trillion dollars in new government spending, and will also cause millions of employers to cancel the health care of their employees.

We have also heard if you like it you can keep it. Not according to this plan. Not even according to the President of the United States, who recently said, quote, "I think that some of the provisions that got snuck in might have violated that pledge."

Madam Speaker, we don't know what is in this bill. The American people don't know what is in this bill. We need to start over.

Let's consider the Seattle Times' editorial this morning: "Right now the government should be focused on the

revival of business and the creation of private sector jobs. This cannot be put off. The responsible vote," according to the Seattle Times, "is 'no'. Take a break, let the economy recover and start over."

I couldn't agree more.

□ 1515

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, after the Cornhusker kickback, the Louisiana purchase, the Gator aid, the labor union bailout, the sweetheart deals for the pharmaceutical companies, now we're told that the Democrats are simply going to deem the Senate bill without voting on it.

Not 1 hour ago, I had Jennifer Neill of Athens, Texas, a middle schooler, in my office, and she said, That's not right. Why is something obvious to a middle schooler such a mystery to the Speaker and the Democrats?

What's not right is to ignore the wishes of the American people. What's not right is to have the government force you to buy health insurance. What's not right is to take health care decisions away from your doctor and give them to Washington bureaucrats and politicians. What's not right is adding \$2.7 trillion in new spending as the Democrats triple our national debt and bankrupt Americans.

What is right is to scrap the bill, start over, and let freedom ring in America.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, we find ourselves in a unique circumstance in this Congress after over two centuries. This is likely the very first time that something is positioned to happen that the Founding Fathers never envisioned: That there would be a bill that couldn't be passed in the Senate, and that wasn't supported by the Senate, that wasn't supported by the House, that could nevertheless become law. The first time in history.

There are only 59 votes over there in the Senate. They would not pass this bill that this House is being asked to pass. Even the Democrats don't support the Senate version of the bill. That's on a promise that it would be on a reconciliation package that we know will not be sustained on the Senate side.

And another unique component of this is that ever since 1973, the people on that side have argued that the Federal Government has no business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. Now their position is

that the Federal Government has every right to tell everybody in America what they can or can't do with their body. Madam Speaker, this bill funds abortion. It funds illegals. It steals liberty. It's unconstitutional. It kicks off lawsuits. It spends trillions of dollars. It's irresponsible. It's a theft of liberty, and it's wrong.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I have been listening to the speeches that have been made on the floor: Tell them to wait and start over. Well, you know, it's nice to say wait and start over when you have insurance, but think about the 46 million people that are walking the streets of the United States of America with no insurance, but you are telling them to wait. And then of course you talk about people that are locked into jobs and working on those jobs because of the fact that the only reason they stay there is because they are able to get health insurance, and you're telling them to wait?

And then we talk about people that have preexisting conditions that can't get health care, and you're telling them to wait?

You know, I cannot believe that we're sitting here in the United States House of Representatives when we can do something about a problem that has existed for many, many years, and we are still telling people to wait. I don't think that you can afford the luxury of waiting when you do not have insurance.

Think about how many people will die today because of the fact they do not have health insurance.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, oftentimes on this floor this document becomes the inconvenient truth. It's called the Constitution of the United States. It tells us what we can and what we cannot do.

Not too many years ago, the House of Representatives and the United States Senate decided they would pass something called the line item veto. Sounded like a great idea. The only problem? It's unconstitutional.

The court at that time said the Constitution makes it very clear. The House has to pass a certain text, the Senate has to pass the exact same text, the President has to review it and then sign the same text.

You can't deem a law to be a law. The dictionary is over here. Deem doesn't mean it is. It means that it's not. It may be close. We'll pretend it is. That's not what the Constitution says.

The court has told us it has to be the exact text. If you change one paragraph, it is unconstitutional. They want us to adopt a rule that includes the bill but a lot of other language. It's not the same text. It's unconstitutional.

The inconvenient truth is we have to follow the law, and this is the supreme law of the land.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. AUSTRIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTRIA. Madam Speaker, this week marks a defining moment for this Congress and our Nation. With our national debt over \$12 trillion and continuing to grow while government encroaches into every aspect of our lives, the American people have spoken out loudly against any government takeover of their health care. All we have to do is listen to our constituents. Yet this administration and this Democrat leadership continues to force a \$1 trillion health care bill of Congress into law.

This bill will increase the health care costs for millions of Americans who are satisfied with their current health care coverage. It will cut Medicare and reduces benefits for seniors, such as Medicare Advantage. It will raise taxes on families and small businesses.

We all agree that our health care system can and should be improved. Unfortunately, Members of Congress are not listening to the American people, and that is that more government is not the answer.

It is time to work together on a commonsense, step-by-step approach that will lower costs and make health care more affordable and accessible while keeping your doctor-patient relationship and choices.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong objection to what occurred yesterday in the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee passed a shell of a reconciliation bill. This shell bill will be replaced with whatever the Rules Committee deems as appropriate health care legislation. No one has seen what the Rules Committee plans to insert.

This is not an open and transparent process. An open and transparent process wouldn't be resorting to using shell bills. An open and transparent process wouldn't have had backroom negotiations that are far and away from the C-SPAN cameras. What happened in the Budget Committee and what's happening in the Rules Committee is not what the American people want.

I strongly oppose the majority's use of the parliamentary gimmicks to pass

big government takeover of health care.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, looks like we may have a mystery worthy of an investigation by Scooby Doo and his gang here. This week, the House may pass a bill to overhaul one-sixth of our economy. But here we are Tuesday, and Scooby and Shaggy are scratching their heads trying to figure out, one, what's in the bill; two, what special backroom deals have been cut, and three, how can Democrats impose on the American people a bill they don't even have the courage to vote on.

Here are our clues. Speaker PELOSI says we're not allowed to see what's in the bill until it passes, and she says "no one" wants to vote for the bill that she's forcing through. We know there are special payoffs for States like Nebraska. We know there are political payoffs. We know there are tax hikes and Medicare cuts, and it's not a mystery why the Democrats are going to try to invent a ghostly scheme to pass this terrible bill.

And when the Scooby gang unmasks the ghost, we'll hear the Speaker say, I would have gotten away with it, too, if it weren't for those meddling Americans. Ruh-roh.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, the basic tenets of a democracy are those that protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Accessible, affordable health care that protects life is one of those tenets. This is why I applaud President Obama for his strength and determination in pushing for health care reform in the face of great adversity.

I support H.R. 3962, the Health Care Reform Bill, that passed the U.S. House on November 7, 2009, because it tries to provide affordable health care while protecting life. And I stand ready to support health care reform again so long as the reconciliation bill seeks the same goals.

As of now, the Senate health care bill falls short and even contradicts the most basic principle of civilization: Thou shalt not kill. The Senate bill willfully excludes the language of the Hyde Amendment and seeks to expand funding and the role of the Federal Government in the despicable killing of the unborn. It also fails to incorporate provisions to protect the conscience of medical providers regarding abortion, as found in the Hyde-Weldon Amendment. These flaws are so devastating in their effects that they over-

ride any good the Senate health care bill seeks to promote.

Until this House fixes the abortion language and incorporates a conscience protection clause, I stand firmly in opposition.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. TURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I am just a bill, and I am sitting here on Capitol Hill waiting for a vote, apparently, unless you're in NANCY PELOSI's House. Unlike in "School House Rock," NANCY PELOSI says that this little guy doesn't need to wait around for a vote. He can be deemed to be passed.

Now, this is a new one for my daughter Jessica's high school government class. They can't understand how Speaker PELOSI can deem a bill passed without a vote. There is no deeming a bill passed in "School House Rock" or in the expectations of the American people.

In today's Washington Post, Speaker PELOSI tells us why she wants to deem the health care bill passed without a vote. She suggests that it politically protects lawmakers who are reluctantly supporting the measure. However, the American people are smart. They know that for this bill to become law, it takes a vote.

Madam Speaker, let's stop the parliamentary tricks. Let's bring this bill to a vote, and I will be voting "no."

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, the American people have made it very clear that they do not like or want this bill. How arrogant is it for the other side of the aisle to say to them, We know what's best for you, and we're going to pass it anyway. And then how arrogant is it for the other side of the aisle to say, We don't have to take a vote on this bill. We'll just deem it law.

In both cases the other side of the aisle is grossly underestimating the intelligence of the American people. The American people know that deeming is a vote on a bill that they don't like. Let's just have an up-or-down vote if we have to have a vote on this, and I vote "no."

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, the Founding Fathers established this Congress so that individuals would be elected from all over the country, come here with different points of view, discuss those views, yes, but ultimately

take a vote on the issues of the day. And then the people who sent them here—the voters—could hold them accountable for the votes they cast here in this Chamber and in the other body across the way.

It would be inconceivable to them that this House would deem a bill passed without taking a direct vote up-or-down on the substance of the matter so that the voters back home could hold them accountable, and yet that is exactly the direction that this leadership tries to take the House today.

The American people already do not trust this institution. They do not believe that we are in touch with them and listening to them. The intentions of the leadership of this House will only carry those suspicions further and further betray the trust that American people should have in their elected representatives.

We should start over and do it again.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I don't think the American people can be any clearer. They do not want this government-run health care bill that the President and leaders in this Congress are trying to ram down their throats. The leadership in this House have declared that socialized health care will become law without taking a vote on the actual bill. They are forcing this reconciliation ruse.

It's a simple answer. This bill contains billions of new taxes, kills jobs, provides for taxpayer-funded abortions, and places an enormous debt on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren. The fact is, many Democrats in Congress do not like this bill any more than the American people. They will be forced to vote for it with a promise that it will be fixed later, but we all know that this is an empty promise. It is a reconciliation to nowhere.

The Democrats may control Washington, but the American people still control this country. I urge all of my colleagues to stand up for your constituents and vote "no" on this scam.

□ 1530

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CAMPBELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Speaker, analysts tell us that the Medicare system in this country will be bankrupt in 7 years and that Social Security and Medicaid are not far behind. What that means is we can't pay for the entitlements we've got.

So what does this health care bill do? It adds more entitlements. It's like

learning that you can't pay the mortgage on your house and buying a second one and five more cars. Americans wouldn't do that, but President Obama and the Democrats in this House are going to. We can't pay for the entitlements we've got. Let's pay for them first before we add new ones.

Unfortunately, because of the actions of this House, America is going bankrupt, and this health bill will hasten that bankruptcy. Vote "no" and kill this bill.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have all seen the television program "Deal or No Deal" where you look at this case and you decide whether you want that case or you don't want the case and take the deal or not take the deal. Well, that's what we have, except this time, the Speaker of the House is saying that there may not even be a case, we don't want you to know what's in the case, we just want you to vote for this self-executing rule so that whatever happens happens.

Well, that self-executing rule, Madam Speaker, is well named, because the people that vote for it are probably going to be victims of their own execution at the next congressional election.

Let's have an up-or-down vote, just as the President has suggested, on a real bill, and make people accountable in their congressional districts whether they are for this massive health care bill, a government takeover of health care, or whether they want to keep the current system of private markets, private initiative and the market-based health care system.

Do not make us vote on the self-executing rule.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I have sent or received nearly 750,000 letters and emails from my office and have held 225 constituent town hall meetings. I have a pretty good idea why my constituents are upset about this health care bill. They were promised that it wouldn't tax health care, but it does. They were promised that it wouldn't mandate health care, but it does. They were promised it wouldn't raise taxes on people with incomes less than \$250,000, but it does. You can only pay for this by doing some manipulation of taking \$52 billion from Social Security and \$72 billion from long-term health care. And it doesn't pay doctors to the tune of \$371 billion. It doesn't allow doctors to volunteer at community health centers. It doesn't reduce infection rates at hospitals. And it

doesn't deal with the \$700 billion of waste in health care that we've got to address.

You don't reform health care by demonizing insurance companies, drug companies and doctors. And Americans are saying we've got to reform health care, not just continue to pass bills that are facades to real health reform.

And that's why they're mad as hell.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, the American people, and I think myself would like to see health care reform. There is a lot of room for improvement. There are a lot of people that don't have coverage or access to affordable health care.

Most of the people I talk to want their premiums down if they do have insurance. If you talk to Americans, what do they want now? They want jobs, and they want the economy expanded so people can even get their own health care. What they also want is a bipartisan effort on behalf of Congress to get these things done.

Instead, what they've got in all of the proposals before us is a proposal to cut Medicare and to dramatically increase taxes. What they wanted was some transparency in this process and openness. Instead, they are getting a closed-door deal and a back-door deal that is not transparent, not open to bipartisanship, imposes taxes on all Americans and, in fact, cuts Medicare for our poorest and oldest citizens. They just don't get it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. CRENSHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I think most of you all know that the movie "Alice in Wonderland" opened in a theater near you just this last week. It's in three dimensions. And it obviously has inspired our Democratic friends in an effort to explain what is going on in this make-believe world they have created up here. There is an exchange in that "Through the Looking Glass" where Humpty Dumpty is talking to Alice. And Humpty Dumpty says, When I use a word, it means exactly what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less. But Alice asks the insightful question, Well, can you really make words mean so many different things?

And I think that is the question the American people are asking. Alice figured out that Humpty Dumpty was just making words mean what he wanted them to mean. And I think the American people are figuring out that the Democrats are just making up words like "vote" and then giving it a different meaning. People are smarter

than that. And I think there's a better way.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I really get a kick out of the Speaker. She thinks the American people don't get what's going on, but they do. The overwhelming majority of Americans don't want this, and they know that she's playing around with the rules here in the House.

And so I just want to make one little statement to the Speaker if she is paying attention. Abraham Lincoln, who was a Member of this body a long time ago, said, You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

And if those people on that side of the aisle vote for this turkey, they're going to pay in November.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, one of my favorite things to do is go to a local high school and talk to government classes. For the past 10 years that I've been doing this, I have always told them, there are certain things that are done in the House that are there to protect the minority. One is during appropriation bills: any Member can bring any amendment to the floor on anything they want to that is germane to the bill, and the leadership can't stop them, even their own party or the other party.

This past year, I wasn't able to say that anymore because for the first time in the history of this institution, every appropriation bill that came to the floor was brought under a closed rule so only the amendments that the majority wanted to be offered could be offered.

Something similar is happening here. All of us have told classes that we have taught that your history books are right, if a bill passes the House and a different bill passes the Senate, the House will have to vote on it again. But here we're being told, no, you don't have to do that anymore. You can deem it passed. It just magically appears back in the Senate without having a vote here in the House.

Our institution, this institution, the people's institution, deserves better than that.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GRAVES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to this

piece of legislation. This is a government takeover of health care. Over the last few months, the American people have voiced their opposition to this bill loud and clear. They know that this bill is being pushed with false promises and backroom deals, and they have had enough. This bill will put the American Government between patients and their doctors. It's going to raise taxes and increase regulations. It will hurt small business owners, the very people who create 7 out of every 10 jobs in this country, by hitting them with impossible mandates.

Make no mistake: this bill will destroy jobs in this country and freeze our economic recovery.

Madam Speaker, Americans know that the answer to the problems in our health care system is not bigger government and more bureaucrats. The answer is more competition and better choices. My colleagues and I have introduced several commonsense reform pieces, but they have been ignored by the majority. It's not too late to start over on legislation that will increase access for all Americans and help control costs. However, this bill is not the answer. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MCCARTHY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, just last week I was listening to the Speaker talk about health care. She said—and I had to actually look it up in the transcripts because I couldn't believe what I heard—Madam Speaker, Speaker PELOSI said, "We have to pass it so you can see what's in it." Well, she was wrong then, and she is wrong now. The Democratic majority in this people's House is not listening to the people. Americans do not want this bill.

How do we know this? Well, because in my own town halls last summer, which I had in Bakersfield, California, and Paso Robles, more than 5,000 constituents turned out just to say that. And it is not just because they don't know what's in the bill. They get it. They don't like it. They don't like the political payoffs, the job-killing tax hikes, the huge cuts in Medicare; and most of all, they don't like Washington running their health care.

Maybe that's why this House Democratic majority is poised to use the parliamentary procedure to pass this bill without an actual vote. By doing this, the House majority will prove, once again, they are not listening. It's time for a new direction. Scrap the bill and start over.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, here are 10 reasons why the administration's health bill makes no sense according to Investor's Business Daily. Number one, the people don't want it. In fact, the majority of Americans are opposed to it. Two, doctors don't want it. Three, people are happy with the health care they have. Four, it doesn't cover the people they set out to cover. Five, costs will go up, not down. Six, real cost controls are nowhere to be found. Seven, insurance premiums will rise, not fall. Eight, Medicare is already bankrupting us. Nine, medical care will also deteriorate. And, ten, rationing of care is inevitable.

Madam Speaker, the conclusion is clear: Congress should start over and get it right.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, if the Democrats are so proud of the health care bill, why the subterfuge? Speaker PELOSI said, If we can't cross the fence, we will pole vault over it. We will tunnel under it, we will break through it. In other words, they are going to subvert the legislative process.

If they are so proud of the health care bill, why the Cornhusker kickback? Why the Louisiana purchase? Why the Gator aid? Why the hospital for the folks in Connecticut? Why all the other special interest bills? And if they are so proud, why not post it on the Web page? But, in fact, here is what the Speaker said. These are NANCY PELOSI's words: "We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what's in it." In other words, the height of D.C. arrogance and Beltway we-know-best.

I call on fair-minded Democrats to join me in denouncing this process and standing up for transparent, fair, and open government. Let's have a bill that comes to the floor in which amendments are allowed and one that has come through the committee process.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. MCCAUL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, the American people have spoken loud and clear on this issue as recently as the Massachusetts election. They want health care reform, but they reject this bill. This administration and the Democrat majority have been tone deaf to this message. Speaker PELOSI just said, "We need to pass this bill to see what's in it."

I don't quite understand what that really means. But I will tell you what's in this bill: there's over \$500 billion in tax increases, a cut to Medicare by \$500 billion, a new form of government-run

health care insurance by the Office of Personnel Management, a cut to Social Security by \$4.2 billion, and sweetheart deals, basically legalized bribery, to buy off votes of the Senate by the Louisiana purchase, the Cornhusker kick-back and the Gator aid.

To those Blue Dog Democrats, 40 sitting in conservative districts, do the right thing. Don't walk the plank on this bill. This is still the United States of America, and we're going to take this country back.

□ 1545

UNACCEPTABLE GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT

(Mr. KLINE of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, we have been talking all day about this bill that is that 2,700-page Senate bill, this bill that increases bureaucracies and bureaucrats and gives more government power and more government control. We know the American people don't like it, and we are speaking against it.

But that is not bad enough. At the same time, using this convoluted parliamentary procedure, our Democratic colleagues want to have the government take over the student lending business, build up bigger bureaucracy, wipe out 30,000 private sector jobs, make the Department of Education one of the largest banks in the country lending \$100 billion a year of money that we don't have, money that we have to borrow from China before we can lend it to students.

So whether it is health care or it is student lending, we are watching a massive growth of government power, size, and spending, and I deem that unacceptable.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intent to offer a resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct initiated an investigation into allegations related to earmarks and campaign contributions in the Spring of 2009.

Whereas, on December 2, 2009, reports and findings in seven separate matters involving the alleged connection between earmarks and campaign contributions were forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics to the Standards Committee.

Whereas, on February 26, 2010, the Standards Committee made public its report on the matter wherein the Committee found, though a widespread perception exists among corporations and lobbyists that campaign contributions provide a greater chance of obtaining earmarks, there was no evidence

that Members or their staff considered contributions when requesting earmarks.

Whereas, the Committee indicated that, with respect to the matters forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics, neither the evidence cited in the OCE's findings nor the evidence in the record before the Standards Committee provided a substantial reason to believe that violations of applicable standards of conduct occurred.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics is prohibited from reviewing activities taking place prior to March of 2008 and lacks the authority to subpoena witnesses and documents.

Whereas, for example, the Office of Congressional Ethics noted that in some instances documents were redacted or specific information was not provided and that, in at least one instance, they had reason to believe a witness withheld information requested and did not identify what was being withheld.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics also noted that they were able to interview only six former employees of the PMA Group, with many former employees refusing to consent to interviews and the OCE unable to obtain evidence within PMA's possession.

Whereas, Roll Call noted that "the committee report was five pages long and included no documentation of any evidence collected or any interviews conducted by the committee, beyond a statement that the investigation 'included extensive document reviews and interviews with numerous witnesses.'" (Roll Call, March 8, 2010)

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee included in their investigation any activities that occurred prior to 2008.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee interviewed any Members in the course of their investigation.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee, in the course of their investigation, initiated their own subpoenas or followed the Office of Congressional Ethics recommendations to issue subpoenas. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House of Representatives, with respect to the activities addressed in its report of February 26, 2010, (1) how many witnesses were interviewed, (2) how many, if any, subpoenas were issued in the course of their investigation, and (3) what documents were reviewed and their availability for public review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF RED CROSS MONTH

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 311) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of Red Cross Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 311

Whereas the American National Red Cross, one of the most well-known humanitarian organizations in the world, was founded by Clara Barton in Washington, DC, on May 21, 1881;

Whereas the American National Red Cross received a congressional charter in 1905 setting forth the purposes of the organization, which include giving relief to and serving as a medium of communication between members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their families, and providing national and international disaster relief and mitigation;

Whereas the American National Red Cross depends on the support of the people of the United States to accomplish the mission of the organization;

Whereas the American National Red Cross has been at the forefront of helping individuals and families prevent, prepare for, and respond to disasters for more than 127 years, including more than 70,000 disasters annually, ranging from apartment and single-family home fires, the most common type of disaster, to hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, wildfires, tornadoes, hazardous materials spills, transportation accidents, explosions, and other natural and human-caused disasters;

Whereas, when a disaster strikes or is imminent, communities throughout the United States depend on the American National Red Cross to help meet the basic and urgent needs of affected individuals, including shelter, food, healthcare, and mental health services;

Whereas the "Be Red Cross Ready" safety program encourages the people of the United States to take the 3 actions that will help them "Be Red Cross Ready" for a disaster: "Get a Kit, Make a Plan, Be Informed";

Whereas the "Be Red Cross Ready" safety program represents a major effort by the American National Red Cross to encourage the people of the United States to be more prepared for a disaster or other emergency;

Whereas, since 1943, every President of the United States has proclaimed March to be "Red Cross Month"; and

Whereas the American National Red Cross uses Red Cross Month as an opportunity to promote the services and programs the organization provides to the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Red Cross Month;

(2) recognizes the contributions of American National Red Cross volunteers in times

of natural and human-caused disasters, and in times of armed conflict; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to "Get a Kit, Make a Plan, and Be Informed".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak today and to vote on H. Res. 311, a bill I introduced to honor one of the most well-known humanitarian organizations in the world, the American National Red Cross. This bill expresses the support of the House of Representatives for the work of this important institution by honoring March as Red Cross Month.

Since the American National Red Cross was founded by Clara Barton on May 21, 1881, the organization has been at the forefront of providing relief to individuals around the world during times of great crisis. The American National Red Cross provides relief for more than 70,000 disasters annually, ranging from small home fires to hurricanes, floods, tornados, conflicts, and earthquakes, such as those that recently struck in Haiti and Chile. And I understand there was a 4.4 earthquake today in the Los Angeles area.

The American National Red Cross has had a presence in Haiti since 2004, supporting local disaster preparedness, HIV education, malaria prevention, and measles immunization programs.

In the 2 months since the devastating earthquake struck on January 12, the American National Red Cross has allocated \$106.4 million for Haitian relief and development and efforts to provide both short-term and long-term assistance to the survivors. In just 2 months, the global Red Cross network has provided relief items for 400,000 people, including 99,000 tarps, tents, shelter tool kits, and meals for more than 1 million people, 40 million liters of clean drinking water, built more than 1,100 latrines, helped vaccinate more than 125 people, treated more than 55,000 people at Red Cross hospitals or mobile clinics, and assisted more than 25,000 people who arrived in the United States following the earthquake.

With an estimated 1.3 million Haitians left homeless by the earthquake, the difficult and noble work the Amer-

ican National Red Cross has undertaken in Haiti is an effort that each and every American can be proud of. However, the relief they bring to Haiti is only one example in over 129 years of exemplary humanitarian service.

This institution represents the best aspect of the American spirit to people all around the world. When a disaster strikes, the sign of the Red Cross is a source of comfort and hope, and a reminder of the generosity and the caring nature of the United States and its citizens.

Since 1943, every President of the United States has proclaimed March as Red Cross Month, and I urge my colleagues to continue this tradition and support H. Res. 311.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 311, introduced by my good friend from California, Ambassador Watson. For the past 129 years, the American Red Cross has been providing material and emotional support to victims of disasters and to our military families. Many of us know the story of the founding of the national organization by Clara Barton in the aftermath of her service during the Civil War. But, my colleagues may be less familiar with the fact that 93 years ago this week, Miami philanthropist Harriet Parsons James convened a group of local residents to begin the southeastern Florida chapter of the American Red Cross. A month later, Mrs. Florence Spottswood of Key West gathered a group of local leaders in the Keys to start what soon became the Key West chapter of the American Red Cross. Madam Speaker, the Spottswood family name is still associated with philanthropy and altruistic good works in the Florida Keys.

After several years of humanitarian service, those organizations merged in May of 1987, and today the South Florida Region American Red Cross continues to be an indispensable neighbor to the people of my congressional district. In the past year, it has responded to 556 local emergencies, delivered nearly 1,000 emergency messages to and from military families, and trained more than 19,000 people in lifesaving skills in our community. Whether it is in response to hurricanes, in response to house fires, the volunteers and supporters of the South Florida Region continue to provide critical aid, for which we are deeply grateful.

Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the earthquake in Haiti, the American Red Cross in Miami-Dade, Broward, Monroe, and Palm Beach counties assisted more than 13,000 U.S. citizens who were flown to south Florida by the U.S. Government. They served nearly 10,000 meals. They provided mental health support to nearly 2,000 people. Nationwide, the American Red Cross has

raised over \$350 million for earthquake relief and development efforts. It has already used more than \$100 million to provide food, water, relief supplies, shelter, and health services to the people of Haiti.

I am proud to join my colleagues in supporting the ideals of Red Cross Month. Whether it is providing disaster relief, safe blood, or communications between our military members and their families, the American Red Cross is one of the most enduring and successful examples of the volunteer spirit at the heart of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, if I could inform Ambassador Watson that I have some more remarks to make, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take a moment to highlight an unfortunate absurdity that we are confronted with today, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud to support the resolution before us, but all of us recognize that dedicated people of the American Red Cross will continue to do their good work regardless of whether they are congratulated by this body. Yet the Democratic leadership has taken care to ensure that this symbolic resolution will receive a vote today—something that they may deny to the trillion-dollar Senate health care bill.

To recap, we're able to debate and vote on this nonbinding resolution. That is well and good. Yet we are denied the chance to vote on this huge, expensive Senate health care bill. The procedure being discussed in the press attempts to get around the basic requirements of the Constitution—that both Houses of Congress must pass the same bill text before it is presented to the President and signed into law.

As the director of the Constitutional Law Center at Stanford Law School, former Federal Circuit Court Judge Michael McConnell wrote in yesterday's Wall Street Journal: "Under Article I, section 7, passage of one bill cannot be deemed to be enactment of another." I'm sorry if the Democratic leadership feels that the burdens of representative government outlined by our Constitution are too great a burden for their agenda to bear. But that momentous bill deserves at least as much consideration as we are giving to the wide range of nonbinding resolutions that we are considering this week.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 311 to recognize the American National Red Cross and to express my support for the Goals and Ideals of Red Cross Month.

The Red Cross is one of the most effective and important disaster relief organizations in the world, and since its founding in 1881, the Red Cross has worked diligently to prevent and relieve suffering. As a non-practicing Registered Nurse, I am still moved by the lifesaving work that the Red Cross does in some

of the most difficult places on the planet, and I am proud to recognize this organization and all of their efforts. Additionally, every President of the United States since 1943 has proclaimed March to be Red Cross Month and because of this, I am happy to join people across the county in supporting this remarkable organization.

Mr. Speaker, the American National Red Cross is one of our country's greatest treasures, and the work that they do is unmatched across the globe. I encourage my fellow colleagues to join me today in supporting this resolution to recognize this organization and support the goals and ideals of Red Cross Month.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTIERREZ). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 311.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING PERSECUTION OF FALUN GONG

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 605) recognizing the continued persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China on the 10th anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party campaign to suppress the Falun Gong spiritual movement and calling for an immediate end to the campaign to persecute, intimidate, imprison, and torture Falun Gong practitioners, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 605

Whereas Falun Gong is a traditional Chinese spiritual discipline founded by Li Hongzhi in 1992, which consists of spiritual, religious, and moral teachings for daily life, meditation, and exercise, based upon the principles of truthfulness, compassion, and tolerance;

Whereas according to the 2008 Annual Report of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, "tens of millions of Chinese citizens practiced Falun Gong in the 1990s and adherents to the spiritual movement inside of China are estimated to still number in the hundreds of thousands despite the government's ongoing crackdown," and other estimates published in Western press place the number of Falun Gong adherents currently in China at the tens of millions;

Whereas in 1996, Falun Gong books were banned in China and state media began a campaign criticizing Falun Gong;

Whereas in 1999, Chinese police began disrupting Falun Gong morning exercises in public parks and began searching the homes of Falun Gong practitioners;

Whereas on April 25, 1999, over 10,000 Falun Gong practitioners gathered outside the State Council Office of Petitions in Beijing, next to the Communist Party leadership compound, to request that arrested Falun Gong practitioners be released, the ban on publication of Falun Gong books be lifted, and that Falun Gong practitioners be allowed to resume their activities without government interference;

Whereas on the same day, immediately after then-Premier Zhu Rongji met with Falun Gong representatives in his office and agreed to the release of arrested practitioners, Communist Party Chairman Jiang Zemin criticized Zhu's actions and ordered a crackdown on Falun Gong;

Whereas in June 1999, Jiang Zemin ordered the creation of the 6-10 office, an extrajudicial security apparatus, given the mandate to "eradicate" Falun Gong;

Whereas in July 1999, Chinese police began arresting leading Falun Gong practitioners;

Whereas on July 22, 1999, Chinese state media began a major propaganda campaign to ban Falun Gong for "disturbing social order" and warning Chinese citizens that the practice of Falun Gong was forbidden;

Whereas in October 1999, Party Chairman Jiang Zemin, according to western press articles, "ordered that Falun Gong be branded as a 'cult', and then demanded that a law be passed banning cults";

Whereas Chinese authorities have devoted extensive time and resources over the past decade worldwide to distributing false propaganda claiming that Falun Gong is a suicidal and militant "evil cult" rather than a spiritual movement which draws upon traditional Chinese concepts of meditation and exercise;

Whereas on October 10, 2004, the House of Representatives adopted by voice vote House Concurrent Resolution 304, which had 75 bipartisan co-sponsors, titled "Expressing the sense of Congress regarding oppression by the Government of the People's Republic of China of Falun Gong in the United States and in China," and that the text of this resolution noted that "the Chinese Government has also attempted to silence the Falun Gong movement and Chinese prodemocracy groups inside the United States";

Whereas, on October 18, 2005, highly respected human rights attorney Gao Zhisheng wrote a letter to Chinese Communist Party Chairman Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao calling for an end to the persecution of Falun Gong and Chinese authorities, in response, closed his law office and took away his law license, with Chinese security forces suspected of being directly involved in Mr. Gao's disappearance on February 4, 2009;

Whereas Gao Zhisheng's family has subsequently been granted political asylum in the United States;

Whereas the United Nations Committee Against Torture in its fourth periodic report of China, issued on December 12, 2008, stated that "The State party should immediately conduct or commission an independent investigation of the claims that some Falun Gong practitioners have been subjected to torture and used for organ transplants and take measures, as appropriate, to ensure that those responsible for such abuses are prosecuted and punished";

Whereas the Amnesty International 2008 annual report states that "Falun Gong practitioners were at particularly high risk of torture and other ill-treatment in detention . . . during the year 2007 over 100 Falun Gong practitioners were reported to have died in detention or shortly after release as a result

of torture, denial of food or medical treatment, and other forms of ill-treatment.";

Whereas according to the 2008 Department of State's Human Rights Report on China, "Some foreign observers estimated that Falun Gong adherents constituted at least half of the 250,000 officially recorded inmates in re-education through labor (RTL) camps, while Falun Gong sources overseas placed the number even higher.";

Whereas according to the 2008 Annual Report of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, "The (Chinese) central government intensified its nine-year campaign of persecution against Falun Gong practitioners in the months leading up to the 2008 Beijing Summer Olympic Games.";

Whereas Falun Gong-related websites remain among the most systematically and hermetically blocked by China's Internet firewall; and

Whereas, according to an April 2009 New York Times report, "In the past year, as many as 8,000 (Falun Gong) practitioners have been detained, according to experts on human rights, and at least 100 have died in custody": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses sympathy to Falun Gong practitioners and their family members who have suffered persecution, intimidation, imprisonment, torture, and even death for the past decade solely because of adherence to their personal beliefs;

(2) calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately cease and desist from its campaign to persecute, intimidate, imprison, and torture Falun Gong practitioners, to immediately abolish the 6-10 office, an extrajudicial security apparatus given the mandate to "eradicate" Falun Gong, and to immediately release Falun Gong practitioners, detained solely for their beliefs, from prisons and re-education through labor (RTL) camps, including those practitioners who are the relatives of United States citizens and permanent residents; and

(3) calls upon the President and Members of Congress to mark the 11th anniversary of Chinese official repression of the Falun Gong spiritual movement appropriately and effectively by publicly expressing solidarity with those practitioners in China persecuted solely because of their personal beliefs, and by meeting with Falun Gong practitioners whenever and wherever possible to indicate that support for freedom of conscience remains a fundamental principle of the United States Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

This resolution recognizes the continued persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China on the 11th anniversary of the government crackdown on the spiritual movement. I would like to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, for introducing this legislation and for her dedication to this issue.

Since 1999, the Chinese government has undertaken a harsh campaign of suppression against the Falun Gong movement, banning its presence in China and banning it as an “illegal cult.” According to the 2009 annual report of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, Chinese authorities “conducted propaganda campaigns that deride Falun Gong, carried out strict surveillance of practitioners, detained and imprisoned large numbers of practitioners, and subjected some who refused to disavow Falun Gong to torture and other abuses in reeducation through labor facilities.” According to the State Department’s latest human rights report on China, the Falun Gong’s core leadership was “singled out for particularly harsh treatment,” and simply believing in the discipline—without publicly practicing any of its tenets—was enough for practitioners to be punished or imprisoned.

Falun Gong is a spiritual movement combining meditation and breathing exercises, with a doctrine loosely rooted in Buddhist and Daoist teachings. The Chinese government banned the group’s existence and its practices in 1999, after thousands of practitioners gathered in Beijing to protest the government’s restrictions on the group’s activities. Chinese authorities are obsessed with eradicating the group because they believe it could pose a challenge to one-party rule and has the potential to generate social unrest and instability.

This resolution calls upon the Chinese government to immediately end its decade-long campaign to prosecute, intimidate, and imprison Falun Gong practitioners solely because of their personal beliefs. It also calls on China to release those practitioners being held in prisons and labor camps throughout the country. Finally, this resolution expresses sympathy to Falun Gong followers and their family members for the suffering that has been inflicted on them at the hands of the Chinese government.

I strongly support this resolution, and urge my colleagues to do the same. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is a delight to work with my wonderful colleague from California, Ambassador WATSON. We greatly regret that she will be retiring from the halls of Congress, but we look forward to working with her in another capacity.

I am proud to rise, Mr. Speaker, as the author of this resolution, which ad-

resses one of the most flagrant examples of systematic persecution against a particular group currently taking place. The Chinese Communist regime’s obsessive and relentless hunting down of Falun Gong practitioners, which is a spiritual discipline based on truthfulness, compassion, and tolerance, says a great deal about the insecurity and the paranoia of the current rulers in Beijing.

While this resolution gives a detailed accounting from authoritative international sources of the last 11 years of Beijing’s bloody crackdown on Falun Gong, there are two particular areas, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to address in greater detail. First is the issue of the penetration of agents of an alien Communist regime right here inside the United States to wage a campaign of repression against U.S. citizens. And, second, is the issue of coercive organ transplants involving a “bloody harvest” from Falun Gong practitioners inside China.

How could one believe that diplomats of a foreign regime would collude with secret agents and thugs to suppress the constitutional right of our fellow citizens right here in America? Well, Mr. Speaker, clear evidence indicates that that is exactly what is happening with Chinese agents persecuting American Falun Gong practitioners in our own country.

Just ask Bill Fang, who was assaulted on the streets of Chicago back in 2001, as he was peacefully demonstrating in front of the Chinese consulate. That assault led to a criminal conviction in the Circuit Court of Cook County. Or, just ask Judy Chen, the proud mother of two United States Marines then serving in Iraq, who was manhandled in May of 2008 by thugs with reported Chinese regime ties while she was handing out Falun Gong literature in front of a public library in Flushing, New York.

□ 1615

It is high time for our State Department to get tough and to let the Chinese regime know that any of its staff members who engage in activities in the U.S. incompatible with their diplomatic status, including encouraging such illegal acts, are persona non grata in the United States.

On the issue of organ transplants, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that this resolution cites the recommendation of the U.N. Committee on Torture, calling for an independent investigation “into the claims that some Falun Gong practitioners have been subjected to torture and used for organ transplants.”

I would like to further point out that expert testimony given before a subcommittee on the Foreign Affairs Committee appears to corroborate the charges of coercive organ transplants in China. A hearing was held before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on September 29, 2006, entitled “Falun Gong: Organ Harvesting

and China’s Ongoing War on Human Rights.” Committee witness Kirk Allison, Ph.D. of the University of Minnesota testified: “In my meeting with practitioners in June 2006, evidence included transcripts of queries to identified hospitals and physicians on organ availability. Falun Gong sources were characterized as being of high quality and often available in as short a time as a week, and in some cases with a guarantee of a backup organ should the first fail.”

The systematic killing of Falun Gong practitioners for their organs is almost too ghoulish to imagine. It seems incomprehensible that in the 21st century such barbaric acts could occur, a cruelty comparable to imperial Romans throwing Christian martyrs to be eaten by lions. The stark reality which this resolution addresses gives new meaning to the phrase “butchers of Beijing.” The Beijing regime of today engages in the barbaric repression of some of its own people simply because they seek to practice a peaceful spiritual discipline. Several hundred have reportedly died, and hundreds of thousands remain in detention in reeducation through labor camps. How can anyone seriously call these the actions of a responsible stakeholder? I strongly and enthusiastically urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California, Representative LYNN WOOLSEY, chairwoman of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Workforce Protections and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. First of all, I would like to thank the two women who are here bringing this resolution to the House floor. It’s so very important. I rise today in support of H. Res. 605, a resolution recognizing the continuing persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China.

In 2002, Mr. Speaker, I authored a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the Chinese Government’s oppression of Falun Gong in the United States and in the People’s Republic of China. Sadly, 8 years later, the persecution continues. People are being sent to jail, to work camps and are assaulted for their practice of Falun Gong. China has claimed that the Falun Gong practitioners are “disturbing social order” and have labeled the practice an evil cult.

International media reports have found that over 100 Falun Gong followers have died in the custody of the Chinese Government. All people, even those in China, have the internationally recognized freedoms of association and religion. The Chinese Government must put a stop to this inhumane persecution. I urge my colleagues, stand up for human rights and vote “yes” on this resolution, H. Res. 605.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 605, defending the human rights of Falun Gong practitioners, savagely persecuted by the Chinese government, and thank my good friend Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for introducing this resolution.

On the tenth anniversary of the Falun Gong's inspiring silent protest at Zhongnanhai many people still do not understand the savagery of the Mao-style campaign which the Communist Party unleashed in 1999.

The story of a typical Falun Gong arrest is horrific: first the government beats them, later it tortures them, molesting and sometimes raping women, sends them to forced labor camps and then brainwashing classes, all the while a high-profile publicity campaign defames and humiliates them. And it has been documented that it has killed at least 3,000 of the Falun Gong.

Members of Falun Gong will not pretend to accept Marxism-Leninism, and so the government brands them an "evil cult." They practice non-violence, and the government assaults them with cattle prods. Their hearts are remarkably serene, and so the government engages in psychiatric torture.

The Falun Gong are one of a wide array of religious faiths and spiritual groups in China, yet members of Falun Gong are the majority of all reported cases of torture and half of China's labor camp population—well over one hundred thousand of them.

Many of the Falun Gong have fled to America, and the government has followed them here, cyber-attacking their American Web sites, installing agents in their midst, and raising crowds to harass and beat them, as happened last year in New York.

Mr. Speaker, one of the invaluable things about this resolution is that it officially documents this Chinese-government sponsored violence on American soil, exercised against American citizens.

We need to learn more about whether our government is doing everything it can to protect the Falun Gong here in America.

I was in China last July, trying to visit human rights activists in the run-up to the Olympics. I remember going into an Internet cafe and trying to look up Falun Gong. You know the story: nothing. Search engines had been doctored. I wonder, if I were not a U.S. Congressman, would that search have gotten me identified, tracked, and tortured? After all, even foreign journalists who ask about Falun Gong have been arrested, and some have been beaten.

And would U.S. companies have been involved in identifying me? Sadly, we know it for a well-documented fact, from a six-hour hearing I held in 2006, that some leading U.S. IT companies are involved in censoring the Chinese Internet and turn over personally identifying information to the Chinese Internet police, making it possible to track and imprison dissidents.

I mention this because many members of Falun Gong are great heroes of Internet freedom. Several members have come to my office and demonstrated how they help millions of Chinese men and women break the so-called "Great Firewall of China" with which the Chinese government tries to cut its citizens off from the global Internet.

Mr. Speaker, Falun Gong practitioners have been great witnesses of courage and peace. Again I thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for introducing this resolution.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 605, which condemns the Chinese government's targeted, persistent and egregious persecution of Falun Gong practitioners. This resolution was introduced last year to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party's campaign to suppress the Falun Gong spiritual movement. Sadly, the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners and anyone associated with them, including lawyers who try to defend their human rights, continues today.

Since 1999, 6,000 Falun Gong practitioners have been sentenced to prison, over 100,000 were sentenced to re-education through labor camps, and at least 3,000 died while in police custody. They have been sent to special high security psychiatric hospitals for the "criminally insane" against their will where torture has been widely reported. Lawyers trying to defend their rights have been harassed, beaten and attacked by police officers in order to intimidate them. One of China's most prominent human rights advocates, Gao Zhiseng, who has defended the rights of many individuals attacked for their religious beliefs, was detained by police in February 2009 and his whereabouts are still unknown. The government continues to deny any involvement in his case.

The Government of China censors all media in China and actively opposes any information exposing its brutality and injustice. But the truth is clear to us today. This resolution is a testament to the millions of victims of the Chinese Communist Party that the Chinese government cannot hide the truth, and its victims will not be forgotten.

This resolution also stands as a statement of the U.S. Congress's continued support for the inalienable right to freedom of religion and expression recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that applies to all people everywhere. To be taken seriously as a participant in the twenty-first century global economy, China must take the rights of their citizens seriously. Egregious injustices, such as those suffered by the Falun Gong practitioners and others targeted by the Chinese Communist Party, are unacceptable in a civilized world and must end today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 605, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

THANKING VANCOUVER FOR 2010 WINTER OLYMPICS

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1128) thanking Vancouver for hosting the world during the 2010 Winter Olympics and honoring the athletes from Team USA, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1128

Whereas the people of Canada opened their hearts and their home to the athletes of the world;

Whereas the Olympics foster healthy competition and interaction among nations;

Whereas these games were not without moments of tribulation and tragedy, but the courage and resolve of the athletes to continue was inspirational;

Whereas the United States won a record 37 medals, 9 gold, 15 silver, and 13 bronze;

Whereas the United States won the overall medal count for the first time since 1932, the highest medal total by any one nation in the history of the Winter Olympics;

Whereas the United States men's and women's silver medal hockey teams excited and inspired the games with their world class play;

Whereas Apolo Anton Ohno won his seventh and eighth medals to become the most decorated United States Winter Olympian of all time;

Whereas the United States earned medals in Nordic Combined events for the first time in history, took the gold in men's figure skating, and won a gold medal in bobsledding for the first time since 1948;

Whereas United States teams and individual athletes should be honored for their contributions to these monumental achievements;

Whereas some athletes must overcome great personal adversity to realize their Olympic dreams;

Whereas the strong performances by United States Olympic athletes inspire children across the Nation to engage in physical fitness, work hard, and set high personal goals;

Whereas the dedication and sacrifice of the families, coaches, and communities associated with Olympic athletes should also be recognized; and

Whereas the Olympic torch has been extinguished in Vancouver, but the flame of camaraderie burns on in the hearts and minds of the world community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the City of Vancouver, Team USA, and the athletes of the world for an outstanding and inspiring 2010 Winter Olympics; and

(2) wishes participants in the 2010 Paralympic Winter Games success in their athletic endeavors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include

extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Last month, over 2,600 athletes from 82 nations came together in the beautiful city of Vancouver, Canada, to compete in the 21st Winter Olympic Games. All of us were proud to watch as Team USA not only won more medals than any other country, the first time they had done that since 1932, but the most medals ever won by a single nation in any Winter Games.

Apollo Anton Ohno won his seventh and eighth Olympic medals in short track speed skating, making him the most decorated American Winter Olympian of all time. Americans Lindsey Vonn and Bode Miller both won multiple medals in the thrilling alpine skiing events. American athletes won Olympic medals in the sport of Nordic combined for the first time ever and the first gold in bobsled since 1948. And Evan Lysacek won the gold in the men's figure skating, the first time an American has done that since 1988.

As we celebrate the incredible achievements of Team USA, it is also important to recognize the accomplishments of other nations and athletes. Host nation Canada won 14 gold medals, more than any other country. Some nations won their first Olympic gold medals, others competed for the first time ever.

We will never forget the performance of Canadian Joannie Rochette who had the courage to compete just days after her mother died and ended up winning the silver medal in women's figure skating. And we mourn the loss of an athlete from the country of Georgia who was killed in a luge training run just before the opening ceremony.

Simply getting to the Olympics required an enormous sacrifice from each and every one of the participating athletes. The vast majority of them did not win medals, but all of them tried their best and all had the unique experience of being Olympians. Their determination in the face of adversity helps us all recognize our common values and foster the mutual respect that brings nations closer together.

Olympic athletes inspire young people around the world to set their highest and most ambitious goals, to pursue those goals and to believe that they can achieve their dreams. We salute the athletes of Team USA for serving as role models and for their important contributions to the Olympic ideal.

Finally, we send our thanks to the Canadian people for being such gracious hosts and commend the Vancouver organizing committee for all their efforts to ensure that the games were a great success. And I thank my

good friend and colleague from California, Susan Davis, for taking the initiative to introduce this important resolution. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1128 and join my colleagues in congratulating Team USA and Vancouver, Canada, for an outstanding 2010 Winter Olympics. Though this year's events were initially marked by tragedy, there were also many historic achievements. This year, the United States won the overall medal count for the first time since 1932. In fact, it was the highest medal total by any one nation in the history of the Winter Olympics. I would like to applaud and congratulate our Olympians for this amazing accomplishment.

The determination, the sacrifice, the commitment required of the athletes, their coaches and their families to qualify for the Olympics, let alone medal in the Olympics, is tremendous.

I would like to especially recognize Jennifer Rodriguez, a four-time participant of the Winter Olympic Games and a proud native of my home district of Miami, Florida. Considered to be one of the best long distance skaters in the United States, Jen also carries the unique distinction of being the first Cuban American to win an Olympic medal after taking the bronze in the 1,000 meters and 1,500 meters in 2002.

Again, I would like to congratulate all of the Olympians who competed in the 2010 Winter Games and thank our friends in Canada for hosting us.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Representative SUSAN A. DAVIS, a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Olympics entertain us, inspire us, and humble us. The athletes who participate are committed to a dream, a dream that we, as spectators, are all privileged to witness.

I introduced House Resolution 1128 to honor the athletes who represented the United States in the 2010 Winter Olympic Games and to thank Vancouver, Canada, for showing hospitality to athletes from around the world. American athletes won 37 medals for the United States, the most medals ever won by any nation at a single Olympic Winter Games.

The Olympics fosters good-natured competition between nations and builds a sense of camaraderie in cities and communities around the world. In the United States, we don't identify our Olympians as Californians or Coloradans. We honor and respect them as Americans. With the help of families, coaches and their own inner strength,

these athletes continue to break records and set new standards of athletic performance. We celebrate their victories as national achievements and respect them for their hard work and their dedication in getting there.

□ 1630

The athleticism and dedication of our athletes should be an example to all Americans. Adults and children alike can aspire to be dedicated to a healthy exercise regimen. We can't all be Olympic athletes, but we can all try to keep our bodies fit and healthy.

Mr. Speaker, you may wonder why a San Diegan is honoring Winter Olympians. It's true we don't get quite as much snow as they do in other parts of the country, but we have a strong connection to this Winter Games. Rachel Flatt, the graceful figure skater, and the two Shauns, Shaun Palmer and Shaun White, both accomplished snowboarders, all have ties to San Diego. And also, the U.S. Olympic Training Center south of San Diego is an important training ground for winter athletes.

Athletes benefit from the temperate climate and natural resources of San Diego. They are able to train with Navy SEALs and participate in wind tunnel assessments. This Olympic Training Center helps athletes train for alpine skiing, for freestyle skiing, for bobsled and skeleton, speed skating, luge and snowboard events.

The unsung heroes of the Olympics are the organizers and support staff who create a safe and enjoyable experience for the athletes and spectators. And I want to join all of my colleagues again in thanking Vancouver, Canada for opening its doors to the world and completing the behind-the-scenes work involved in a public event of this nature.

The first-class resources used for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games are now being used for the 2010 Paralympic Games, which began on March 12, and I certainly wish all the participating paralympic athletes an exhilarating and safe competition.

May the flame of the Olympic torch burn bright, and may the dedication and perseverance it represents inspire us for years to come.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative JOHN T. SALAZAR, member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1128, honoring the 2010 American Winter Olympic team. This resolution recognizes the incredible accomplishments of the most decorated group of Winter Olympians in history and graciously thanks the people and the Government of Vancouver, British Columbia, and Canada for hosting Team USA.

I want to draw, however, special attention to the exceptional Vancouver Olympians from the Third Congressional District of Colorado. Trained on

the slopes of Aspen, Steamboat Springs, and Durango, there were 12 Olympians from the Third District competing in the 2010 Olympic Games, one of the highest from any congressional district in the country.

It is no secret that Colorado is a wonderful place to ski, snowboard, ice skate, and the exceptional athletes that competed in Vancouver are an inspiration to the young winter sports enthusiasts across the country. All of us in the Third District are proud, not only of what they have accomplished, but also the way that they have represented themselves, their families, and the State of Colorado and our Nation.

I would like to especially congratulate Johnny Spillane for his three silver medals in individual and team nordic combined, and his teammate Todd Lodwick for his silver in team nordic combined, both of Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

I'm so proud of Team USA, and I will continue to support their efforts. On behalf of the entire Third District of Colorado, congratulations on your success.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Representative JIM McDERMOTT from Washington. He's the chairman of the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by congratulating Canada and Vancouver, specifically, for putting on a great Olympics this winter. They are our neighbor in Seattle, and we welcome and were pleased with having our neighbor have such a good party.

To compete in the Olympics is an enormous accomplishment, and I want to commend each and every one of the Olympians who participated. It's not a national team that goes; it's individuals. The spirit of the Olympics is that an individual strives to have his best or her best performance in whatever event he or she is involved in.

And I want to take this time to recognize at least one athlete from my district, in particular, whose career I've followed since he was a young man in Seattle. Apolo Ohno exemplifies what it means to be an Olympian. He trained not in Seattle, but he went up to Canada, to Vancouver, and trained every week. And after winning his eighth medal in this Vancouver Olympics, he is now the most decorated American athlete to compete in the Winter Games. He has now appeared in three Winter Olympics and has both won and lost races, but he has always returned to compete against younger and sometimes even faster opponents.

I also want to congratulate his father, Yuki Ohno, who has raised Apolo by himself, and helped him realize the dream of competing in the Olympics.

When I think about Apolo's achievements and all he has overcome, I recall

a quote from Teddy Roosevelt, who said, "The credit belongs to the man or the woman who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who errs, who comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; but who does actually strive to do the deeds, who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, who spends himself in a worthy cause, who, at the best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who, at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his or her place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

To all the athletes, and to Apolo Ohno especially, I commend you for your performance in this Winter Games.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to take a moment to highlight the fact that shortly before our friends in Canada were kind enough to host the Olympics in Vancouver, my home district of Miami, Florida, was hosting Canadian Premier Danny Williams as he underwent cardiac surgery at Mount Sinai Medical Center, located in my congressional district of Miami Beach.

Responding to criticisms of his decision to receive medical treatment in the U.S., Premier Williams said, and I quote, "This was my heart, my choice, and my health. I did not sign away my right to get the best possible health care for myself when I entered politics."

And that is exactly, Mr. Speaker, what the Republican response to health care reform is all about, making the necessary changes to strengthen our health care system so that the American people may receive the best possible health care in the world. By instituting commonsense, responsible solutions, we can lower health care cost. We can expand access to quality care without a government takeover of our Nation's health care system.

Instead, the majority leadership is hoping to force a health care system on the American people. This would kill jobs, will raise taxes. It will cut Medicare for our Nation's seniors. We have seen time and time again what happens when health care is not patient-centered. Why would we wish that on the American people? Especially when the American people have made it abundantly clear that this is not what they want.

It is time that cool heads prevail so that responsible decisions can be made. We must listen to the American people and not force this health care bill through.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, so I thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleague, Ms. Ros-

LEHTINEN. I'd like to thank the House for the opportunity to honor the achievement of all Olympic athletes who participated in the 2010 Winter Games and the nation of Canada for their successful execution of this event.

The lighting of the Olympic torch every 2 years for both the Summer and the Winter Games initiates the beginning of a great global coming together. All around the world, people are uniquely unified by the thrill of competition and a spirit of sportsmanship.

I recall my own relative back in 1964 who ran in the Japanese Olympics and won the 100-yard dash, and she became quite interested in where this ability came from because her mother played tennis at UCLA. And so she traced us way back and found out that we came from Nancy, France, through Quebec, and then down to and through New Orleans, through the Louisiana Purchase.

But I say all this to say that being an American and having a good health care system is essential. And she would say to me now, We need to reform health care. We need to provide every American with the best health care that money can provide. And so, we are proposing to this House that we do the right thing.

I want more Olympians in my family. My brother has eight children, and I want to see that they all have an opportunity to be their best, like our young people were, and we won the most medals.

I was so happy. And I used to ski when I was teaching school in France, and I am so happy that we are preparing our youth to be winners. And we can only do that if we have a health care system that provides for every American, and that's what we are attempting to put in place.

So I am so proud. And I want to thank our ranking member for bringing health care reform to the attention, and all this morning, from 12 to just a few minutes ago, all their people came, and they weren't too happy with what we were trying to do.

But we're going to clarify the misstatements and we're going to let America know that we cannot wait. We cannot delay health care because we want champions. We want winners in this country. And America has been known for being a Nation of winners, and other countries need to look up to us again. And that is what we are preparing to do.

So I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1128, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4628, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 311, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 605, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1128, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SERGEANT CHRISTOPHER R. HRBEK POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4628, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4628.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—416

Ackerman	Boustany	Coble
Aderholt	Boyd	Coffman (CO)
Adler (NJ)	Brady (PA)	Cohen
Akin	Brady (TX)	Cole
Alexander	Braley (IA)	Conaway
Altmire	Bright	Connolly (VA)
Andrews	Brown (SC)	Conyers
Arcuri	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Austria	Brown-Waite,	Costa
Baca	Ginny	Costello
Bachmann	Buchanan	Courtney
Bachus	Burgess	Crenshaw
Baird	Burton (IN)	Crowley
Baldwin	Butterfield	Cuellar
Barrow	Buyer	Culberson
Bartlett	Calvert	Cummings
Barton (TX)	Camp	Dahlkemper
Bean	Campbell	Davis (AL)
Becerra	Cantor	Davis (CA)
Berkley	Cao	Davis (KY)
Berman	Capito	Davis (TN)
Berry	Capps	DeFazio
Biggert	Capuano	DeGette
Bilbray	Cardoza	Delahunt
Bilirakis	Carnahan	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Dent
Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Cassidy	Dicks
Blumenauer	Castle	Dingell
Blunt	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Boccieri	Chaffetz	Donnelly (IN)
Boehner	Chandler	Doyle
Bonner	Childers	Dreier
Bono Mack	Chu	Driehaus
Boozman	Clarke	Duncan
Boren	Clay	Edwards (MD)
Boswell	Cleaver	Edwards (TX)
Boucher	Clyburn	Ehlers

Ellison	Larson (CT)
Ellsworth	Latham
Emerson	LaTourette
Engel	Latta
Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Etheridge	Lee (NY)
Fallin	Levin
Farr	Lewis (CA)
Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Filner	Linder
Flake	Lipinski
Fleming	LoBiondo
Forbes	Loeb sack
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe
Foster	Lowey
Fox	Lucas
Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer
Franks (AZ)	Lujan
Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Fudge	Lungren, Daniel E.
Galleghy	Lynch
Garamendi	Mack
Garrett (NJ)	Maffei
Gerlach	Maloney
Giffords	Manzullo
Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Gohmert	Markey (CO)
Gonzalez	Markey (MA)
Goodlatte	Marshall
Gordon (TN)	Matheson
Granger	Matsui
Graves	McCarthy (CA)
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)
Green, Al	McCaul
Green, Gene	McClintock
Griffith	McCollum
Grijalva	McCotter
Guthrie	McDermott
Gutierrez	McGovern
Hall (TX)	McHenry
Halvorson	McIntyre
Hare	McKeon
Harman	McMahon
Harper	McMorris
Hastings (FL)	Rodgers
Hastings (WA)	McNerney
Heinrich	Meek (FL)
Heller	Meeks (NY)
Hensarling	Melancon
Hergert	Mica
Herseht Sandlin	Michaud
Higgins	Miller (FL)
Hill	Miller (MI)
Himes	Miller (NC)
Hinche	Miller, Gary
Hinojosa	Minnick
Hirono	Mitchell
Hodes	Mollohan
Holden	Moore (KS)
Holt	Moore (WI)
Honda	Moran (KS)
Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Hunter	Murphy (CT)
Inglis	Murphy (NY)
Inslee	Murphy, Patrick
Israel	Murphy, Tim
Issa	Myrick
Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY)
Jackson Lee	Napolitano
(TX)	Neal (MA)
Jenkins	Neugebauer
Johnson (GA)	Nunes
Johnson (IL)	Nye
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar
Johnson, Sam	Obey
Jones	Olver
Jordan (OH)	Ortiz
Kagen	Owens
Kanjorski	Pallone
Kennedy	Pascarella
Kildee	Pastor (AZ)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Paul
Kilroy	Paulsen
Kind	Payne
King (IA)	Pence
King (NY)	Perlmutter
Kingston	Perriello
Kirk	Peters
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peterson
Kissell	Petri
Klein (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Kline (MN)	Pitts
Kosmas	Platts
Kratovil	Poe (TX)
Kucinich	Polis (CO)
Lamborn	Pomeroy
Lance	Posey
Langevin	Price (GA)
Larsen (WA)	

Price (NC)	Wilson (OH)
Quigley	Wilson (SC)
Radanovich	Wittman
Rahall	
Rangel	
Rehberg	
Reichert	
Reyes	
Richardson	
Rodriguez	
Roe (TN)	
Rogers (AL)	
Rogers (KY)	
Rogers (MI)	
Rohrabacher	
Rooney	
Ros-Lehtinen	
Roskam	
Ross	
Rothman (NJ)	
Roybal-Allard	
Royce	
Ruppersberger	
Rush	
Ryan (OH)	
Ryan (WI)	
Salazar	
Sanchez, Linda T.	
Sanchez, Loretta	
Sarbanes	
Scalise	
Schakowsky	
Schauer	
Schiff	
Schmidt	
Schock	
Schrader	
Schwartz	
Scott (VA)	
Sensenbrenner	
Serrano	
Sessions	
Sestak	
Shadegg	
Shea-Porter	
Sherman	
Shimkus	
Shuler	
Shuster	
Simpson	
Sires	
Skelton	
Slaughter	
Smith (NE)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	
Smith (WA)	
Snyder	
Souder	
Space	
Speier	
Spratt	
Stearns	
Stupak	
Sullivan	
Sutton	
Tanner	
Taylor	
Teague	
Terry	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiahrt	
Tiberi	
Tierney	
Titus	
Tonko	
Towns	
Tsongas	
Turner	
Upton	
Van Hollen	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Walden	
Walz	
Wasserman	
Schultz	
Waters	
Watson	
Watt	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Welch	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	

Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Wolf
Woolsey
Wu

Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Barrett (SC)	Hoekstra	Scott (GA)
Brown (GA)	Kaptur	Stark
Davis (IL)	Miller, George	Wamp
Deal (GA)	Olson	Young (FL)
Hall (NY)	Putnam	

□ 1713

Mr. LYNCH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF RED CROSS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 311, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 311.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—417

Ackerman	Brown (GA)	Crowley
Aderholt	Brown (SC)	Cuellar
Adler (NJ)	Brown, Corrine	Culberson
Akin	Brown-Waite,	Cummings
Alexander	Ginny	Dahlkemper
Altmire	Buchanan	Davis (AL)
Andrews	Burgess	Davis (CA)
Arcuri	Burton (IN)	Davis (IL)
Austria	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Baca	Calvert	Davis (TN)
Bachmann	Camp	DeFazio
Bachus	Campbell	DeGette
Baird	Cantor	Delahunt
Baldwin	Cao	DeLauro
Barrow	Capito	Dent
Bartlett	Capps	Diaz-Balart, L.
Barton (TX)	Capuano	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bean	Cardoza	Dicks
Becerra	Carnahan	Dingell
Berkley	Carney	Doggett
Berman	Carson (IN)	Donnelly (IN)
Berry	Carter	Doyle
Biggert	Cassidy	Dreier
Bilbray	Castle	Driehaus
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Duncan
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Edwards (MD)
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Edwards (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Childers	Ehlers
Blackburn	Chu	Ellison
Blumenauer	Clarke	Ellsworth
Blunt	Clay	Emerson
Boccieri	Cleaver	Engel
Boehner	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bonner	Coble	Etheridge
Bono Mack	Coffman (CO)	Fallin
Boozman	Cohen	Farr
Boren	Cole	Fattah
Boswell	Conaway	Filner
Boucher	Connolly (VA)	Flake
Boustany	Conyers	Fleming
Boyd	Cooper	Forbes
Brady (PA)	Costa	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Costello	Foster
Braley (IA)	Courtney	Fox
Bright	Crenshaw	Frank (MA)

Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gallegly
 Garamendi
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gordon (TN)
 Granger
 Graves
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Guthrie
 Gutierrez
 Hall (TX)
 Halvorson
 Hare
 Harman
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heinrich
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick (MI)
 Kilroy
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Kissell
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Kosmas
 Kratovil
 Kucinich
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NY)
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack

Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMahon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olson
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paul
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Reyes

Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shadegg
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Souder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Taylor
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

Barrett (SC)
 Butterfield
 Deal (GA)
 Griffith
 Hall (NY)
 Putnam
 Rush
 Schrader
 Stark
 Teague
 Tsongas
 Wamp
 Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1722

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING PERSECUTION OF FALUN GONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 605, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 605, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—412

Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Adler (NJ)
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Arcuri
 Austria
 Baca
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boccieri
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)

Bright
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butcherfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Cao
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castle
 Castor (FL)
 Chaffetz
 Childers
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cohen
 Cole
 Conaway
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Crenshaw

Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gallegly
 Garamendi
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Gordon (TN)
 Granger
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Guthrie
 Gutierrez
 Hall (TX)
 Halvorson
 Hare
 Harman
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heinrich
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Inglis
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan (OH)
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick (MI)
 Kilroy
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Kissell
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Kosmas
 Kratovil
 Kucinich
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NY)
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey

Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Markey (CO)
 Markey (MA)
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McMahon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Minnick
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olson
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shadegg
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Souder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Taylor
 Teague
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Walden
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC)	Graves	Putnam
Buyer	Griffith	Schrader
Chandler	Hall (NY)	Stark
Chu	Himes	Wamp
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Young (FL)
Gohmert	McIntyre	

□ 1730

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Recognizing the continued persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China on the 11th anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party campaign to suppress the Falun Gong spiritual movement and calling for an immediate end to the campaign to persecute, intimidate, imprison, and torture Falun Gong practitioners."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 118, I was off the floor with a constituent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 117 and 118, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

THANKING VANCOUVER FOR 2010 WINTER OLYMPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1128, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1128, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—420

Ackerman	Biggart	Bright
Aderholt	Bilbray	Brown (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Bilirakis	Brown (SC)
Akin	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine
Alexander	Bishop (NY)	Brown-Waite,
Altmire	Bishop (UT)	Ginny
Andrews	Blackburn	Buchanan
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Burgess
Austria	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Baca	Bocchieri	Butterfield
Bachmann	Boehner	Buyer
Bachus	Bonner	Calvert
Baird	Bono Mack	Camp
Baldwin	Boozman	Campbell
Barrow	Boren	Cantor
Bartlett	Boswell	Cao
Barton (TX)	Boucher	Capito
Bean	Boustany	Capps
Becerra	Boyd	Capuano
Berkley	Brady (PA)	Cardoza
Berman	Brady (TX)	Carnahan
Berry	Braley (IA)	Carney

Carson (IN)	Hensarling	McNerney
Carter	Herger	Meek (FL)
Cassidy	Herseth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)
Castle	Higgins	Melancon
Castor (FL)	Hill	Mica
Chaffetz	Himes	Michaud
Chandler	Hinchev	Miller (FL)
Childers	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)
Chu	Hirono	Miller (NC)
Clarke	Hodes	Miller, Gary
Clay	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Cleaver	Holden	Minnick
Clyburn	Holt	Mitchell
Coble	Honda	Mollohan
Coffman (CO)	Hoyer	Moore (KS)
Cohen	Hunter	Moore (WI)
Cole	Inglis	Moran (KS)
Conaway	Inslee	Moran (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Israel	Murphy (CT)
Conyers	Issa	Murphy (NY)
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Costa	Jackson Lee	Murphy, Tim
Costello	(TX)	Myrick
Courtney	Jenkins	Nadler (NY)
Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Cummings	Jones	Nye
Dahlkemper	Jordan (OH)	Oberstar
Davis (AL)	Kagen	Obey
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Olson
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Olver
Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Ortiz
Davis (TN)	Kildee	Owens
DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pallone
DeGette	Kilroy	Pascarell
Delahunt	Kind	Pastor (AZ)
DeLauro	King (IA)	Paul
Dent	King (NY)	Paulsen
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Payne
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Pence
Dicks	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter
Dingell	Kissell	Perriello
Doggett	Klein (FL)	Peters
Donnelly (IN)	Kline (MN)	Peterson
Doyle	Kosmas	Petri
Dreier	Kratovil	Pingree (ME)
Driehaus	Kucinich	Pitts
Duncan	Lamborn	Platts
Edwards (MD)	Lance	Poe (TX)
Edwards (TX)	Langevin	Polis (CO)
Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy
Ellison	Larson (CT)	Posey
Ellsworth	Latham	Price (GA)
Emerson	LaTourette	Price (NC)
Engel	Latta	Quigley
Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Radanovich
Etheridge	Lee (NY)	Rahall
Fallin	Levin	Rangel
Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rehberg
Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Reichert
Filner	Linder	Reyes
Flake	Lipinski	Richardson
Fleming	LoBiondo	Rodriguez
Forbes	Loeb sack	Roe (TN)
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (AL)
Foster	Lowe	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Lucas	Rogers (MI)
Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher
Franks (AZ)	Lujan	Rooney
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen
Fudge	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam
Galleghy	E.	Ross
Garamendi	Lynch	Rothman (NJ)
Garrett (NJ)	Mack	Roybal-Allard
Gerlach	Maffei	Royce
Giffords	Maloney	Ruppersberger
Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo	Rush
Gonzalez	Marchant	Ryan (OH)
Goodlatte	Markey (CO)	Ryan (WI)
Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)	Salazar
Granger	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Graves	Matheson	T.
Grayson	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Scalise
Griffith	McCauley	Schakowsky
Grijalva	McClintock	Schauer
Guthrie	McCollum	Schiff
Gutierrez	McCotter	Schmidt
Hall (TX)	McDermott	Schock
Halvorson	McGovern	Schwartz
Hare	McHenry	Scott (GA)
Harman	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Harper	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (FL)	McMahon	Serrano
Heinrich	McMorris	Sessions
Heller	Rodgers	Sestak

Shadegg	Sullivan	Visclosky
Shea-Porter	Sutton	Walden
Sherman	Tanner	Walz
Shimkus	Taylor	Wasserman
Shuler	Teague	Schultz
Shuster	Terry	Waters
Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Watson
Sires	Thompson (MS)	Watt
Skellton	Thompson (PA)	Waxman
Slaughter	Thornberry	Weiner
Smith (NE)	Tiahrt	Welch
Smith (NJ)	Tiberi	Westmoreland
Smith (TX)	Tierney	Whitfield
Smith (WA)	Titus	Wilson (OH)
Snyder	Tonko	Wilson (SC)
Souder	Towns	Wittman
Space	Tsongas	Wolf
Speier	Turner	Woolsey
Spratt	Upton	Wu
Stearns	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Stupak	Velázquez	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Barrett (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Wamp
Deal (GA)	Putnam	Young (FL)
Gohmert	Schrader	
Hall (NY)	Stark	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1737

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 4302 AND H.R. 3457

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 4302 and H.R. 3457, bills originally introduced by Representative Abercrombie of Hawaii, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARAMENDI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 2536

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 2536, a bill originally introduced by Representative Wexler of Florida, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings

today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

RECOGNIZING 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF AUGUSTANA COLLEGE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1089) recognizing the 150th anniversary of Augustana College, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1089

Whereas Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois, was founded as Augustana Seminary under the auspices of the Augustana Synod on September 1, 1860;

Whereas the name Augustana comes from *Confessio Augustana*, the Latin rendering of the seminal statement of the Reformation, the Augsburg Confession;

Whereas Augustana College was initially founded to train Lutheran pastors, teachers, and musicians for the growing settlements of Swedish immigrants in the United States;

Whereas Augustana College began classes in Chicago, moved to Paxton in 1863, and then finally moved to its present location in Rock Island in 1875;

Whereas Augustana College has grown from serving 90 students in 1875 to serving over 2,500 students today;

Whereas Augustana College's mission is to offer a challenging education that develops qualities of mind, spirit, and body necessary for a rewarding life of leadership and service in a diverse and changing world;

Whereas Augustana College offers undergraduate students an education rooted in the liberal arts and sciences through 75 fields of study;

Whereas Augustana College has produced 131 Academic All-America athletes, the sixth highest number of honorees among all schools in the Nation, regardless of size;

Whereas alumni of Augustana College have gone on to achieve success in diverse fields, including business, education, government and public service, religion, arts and entertainment, and science, and include a Nobel Prize winner, CEOs, and Members of Congress; and

Whereas 2010 marks the 150th anniversary of the establishment of Augustana College: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges and congratulates Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois, on the momentous occasion of its 150th anniversary and expresses its best wishes for continued success;

(2) commends Augustana College for its excellence in academics, athletics, and quality of life for students; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to provide Augustana College with enrolled copies of this resolution for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1089 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. I thank my colleague from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for yielding me time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1089, recognizing the 150th anniversary of Augustana College. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 150th year of Augustana College, and I proudly introduce this resolution to highlight Augustana's long tradition of academic excellence and distinction.

Founded in 1860, Augustana College, in Rock Island, Illinois, has grown from a small school educating Swedish immigrants into one of our Nation's premier colleges of the liberal arts and sciences. Today, with over 75 fields of discipline, Augustana, popularly known as Augie, provides a rich liberal arts environment for a diverse student body of over 2,500 students.

Mr. Speaker, at Augustana, students enter to learn and leave to serve. Throughout its 150 years, Augustana College has remained committed to educating its students for a rewarding life of leadership and service in a diverse and changing world. Augie alumni have gone on to achieve success in diverse fields, and graduates include a Nobel Peace Prize winner, CEOs of Fortune 500 companies, and Members of Congress, most notably my predecessor and my good friend, Representative Lane Evans.

Beyond the classroom, Augustana has established itself as a top athletic program with 37 NCAA Division III national titles in six sports and has produced 131 academic All-American athletes, the sixth highest number of honorees among all schools in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, Augie has partnered with the community to promote economic development in the Quad Cities region, and Augustana has an estimated impact of \$75 million on our local economy.

Mr. Speaker, the ongoing success of Augustana can be directly attributed to the quality of the leadership of the college. Under the direction of President Steve Bahls, Augustana has positioned itself to be a flagship college in my district and in the State of Illinois. Also, President Bahls has led efforts to respond to students' immediate needs during the economic downturn. He has made a commitment to help any student at risk of dropping out because of financial difficulties through the creation of the Immediate Scholarship Support Fund, substantial investments in financial aid, and tuition cost control.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I congratulate Augustana College on the historic occasion of its 150th anniversary, and I wish the college, its students, and the faculty continued success.

I would like to thank the entire Illinois delegation for joining me to celebrate Augustana College's 150th year, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1089.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my friend from Illinois bringing this resolution forward, and I rise today in support of this House Resolution 1089, recognizing the 150th anniversary of Augustana College.

Augustana College was founded by Swedish Lutheran settlers in Chicago, Illinois, and moved to Rock Island, Illinois, in 1875. Augustana College has grown from a small school educating Swedish immigrants to a highly selective college of liberal arts and sciences. Today, Augustana College serves 2,500 students from various geographic, social, ethnic, and religious backgrounds.

Students at Augustana receive a personalized liberal arts and science education with a 11-to-1 student-to-faculty ratio. Most of Augustana's students are actively involved in a large variety of groups and activities, including performing arts, debate, publications, social and service organizations.

Augustana has been recognized nationwide for its excellent academics. The Carnegie Foundation has classified the college as an Arts and Science plus Professions institution. Students accepted to Augustana are typically from the top quarter of their high school class and have notable academic histories.

The Augustana Vikings compete in the NCAA Division III athletics in 20 intercollegiate sports and also participate in numerous club and intramural sports. The Vikings have won four team NCAA national championships and 21 individual NCAA national championships.

Augustana College students have excelled in academics, athletics, and all areas of collegiate life. I congratulate Augustana College and the students, faculty, staff, and alumni for 150 years of excellence in education.

I congratulate my colleague on this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1089.

□ 1745

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1089, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1255

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1255.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1167) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1167

Whereas social work is a profession of hope, grounded in practical problem-solving expertise;

Whereas social workers inspire community action, and are dedicated to the successful functioning of American society;

Whereas social workers have education and experience to guide individuals, families, and communities through complex issues and choices;

Whereas social workers stand up for others to make sure everyone has access to the same basic rights, protections, and opportunities, and have been an important force behind important social movements in the United States;

Whereas social workers work through private practices, agencies and organizations, hospitals, the military, government, and educational institutions to provide resources and guidance that support social functioning;

Whereas social workers are on the frontlines, responding to such human needs as homelessness, poverty, family break-up, mental illness, physical and mental disability, substance abuse, domestic violence, and many other issues;

Whereas Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day, which is March 16, 2010, will build awareness of the role of professional social workers and their wide range of social contributions throughout their careers; and

Whereas the 2010 Social Work Month theme—"Social Workers Inspire Community Action"—showcases the expertise and dedication of professional social workers in helping to improve community life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups who promote the importance of social work and who are observing Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages the American people to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to further promote awareness of the life-changing role of social workers; and

(4) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1167 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day. There are more than 600,000 people in the United States who devote their lives to social work and to the improvement of the society in which we live by obtaining social work degrees. Social workers dedicate their time, energy, and career to assisting individuals, families, and communities through complicated social issues and complex choices. As many of you know, social workers have been instrumental in instigating important social movements in the United States and abroad.

Francis Perkins, who championed the minimum wage laws and reduced the work week for women to 48 hours, and Harry Hopkins, who relocated to New Orleans in order to work for the American Red Cross as director of civilian relief, are two examples of social workers who saw a need to change conditions for a community and set out to work in the community to help meet that need.

Social workers use their tools and skills in schools, courtrooms, clinics, nursing homes, and the military, just to name a few. However, the need for social work is expected to grow twice as fast as other occupations, especially within the health care sector as our aging demographics require more services. Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day, which is March 16, 2010, build awareness of professional social workers and their commitment to people. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution honoring those who choose social work as a profession to better society.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1167, expressing support for the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day. Social workers are an important

part of communities throughout the Nation and they inspire community action to improve lives. Social workers know the full range of challenges facing families of every description, and they help people reach their full potential.

Social workers make a wide range of social contributions throughout their careers. Many social workers work to resolve systemic issues that negatively affect a community. Some work in education or research, and others serve as heads of nonprofit organizations to create positive sustainable changes in communities. Most social workers serve individuals and families. Working through private practice, agencies, and organizations, they provide resources and guidance that support social functioning. Many people who become social workers believe there are no limits to human potential, and use their talents to help others.

Social work is a profession of hope, grounded in practical problem-solving expertise. Social workers are employed in schools, courtrooms, drug treatment clinics, hospitals, senior centers, shelters, nursing homes, the military, disaster relief, prisons, and corporations. They are on the front lines, developing social programs that are responsive to such needs as homelessness, poverty, mental illness, physical and mental disability, substance abuse, domestic violence, and many other issues.

This year's Social Work Month theme, "Social Workers Inspire Community Action," showcases the expertise of these dedicated professionals and the impact they have on the improvement of community life. Today, we recognize the contributions of millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

I ask that my colleagues support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1167.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the resolution (H. Res. 1184) congratulating the 2009–2010 University of Maryland Men's Basketball Team, Greivis Vasquez, and Coach Gary Williams on an outstanding season.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1184

Whereas the University of Maryland Terrapins completed the 2009–2010 regular season with 23 wins and 7 losses;

Whereas the Terrapins completed the 2009–2010 Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) season with 13 wins and 3 losses, sharing first place with Duke University;

Whereas on June 15, 2009, Greivis Vasquez elected to forego the National Basketball Association draft and play his senior year with the Terrapins;

Whereas on February 27, 2010, Greivis Vasquez scored a career-high 41 points;

Whereas during the 2009–2010 season, Greivis Vasquez averaged 19.6 points per game;

Whereas during the 2009–2010 season, Greivis Vasquez became the only player in ACC history to record 2,000 points, 700 assists, and 600 rebounds;

Whereas during the 2009–2010 season, Greivis Vasquez received ACC Player of the Week honors four times;

Whereas for the 2009–2010 season, Greivis Vasquez was unanimously selected first team All-ACC by the Atlantic Coast Sports Media Association;

Whereas on March 9, 2010, Greivis Vasquez was named ACC Player of the Year;

Whereas Greivis Vasquez is a finalist for the Bob Cousy Award, which honors the Nation's top collegiate point guard;

Whereas Coach Gary Williams played for the Terrapins and served as team captain in 1967;

Whereas Coach Williams graduated from the University of Maryland in 1968 and returned to coach the men's basketball team of his alma mater in 1989;

Whereas on November 13, 2009, Coach Williams began coaching his 21st season with the University of Maryland;

Whereas in 2002, Coach Williams led the Terrapins to win the national title;

Whereas with 441 wins, Coach Williams is the Terrapins' all-time winningest head basketball coach, having surpassed Charles "Lefty" Driesell who accrued 348 victories in 18 seasons with the University of Maryland;

Whereas in 2005, Coach Williams was inducted into the University of Maryland Alumni Hall of Fame; and

Whereas on March 9, 2010, for the second time in his career, Coach Williams was named ACC Coach of the Year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the University of Maryland Men's Basketball Team is congratulated on an outstanding season;

(2) Greivis Vasquez is congratulated on being named the 2009–2010 Atlantic Coast Conference Player of the Year; and

(3) Coach Gary Williams is congratulated on being named the 2009–2010 Atlantic Coast Conference Coach of the Year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1184 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I now yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution congratulating Greivis Vasquez and Coach Gary Williams on an outstanding season for the University of Maryland Men's Basketball Team. Their home is in Prince Georges County—my home county—and I congratulate the Terrapins men's basketball team on a season that came to a close just last week, ending the season with monumental victories, including a double overtime game win against the Virginia Tech Hokies. The season-ending victory over the University of Virginia placed the Terrapins as the number two seed going into the Atlantic Coast Conference Quarter-Finals.

The Terrapins completed their regular 2009–2010 Atlantic Coast Conference season with an impressive 13 wins and 3 losses, earning first place honors, along with the top-ranked Duke University Blue Devils. I'd like to point out as a point of personal privilege and note that one of the three losses that Maryland faced this year was to the Demon Deacons of Wake Forest University, my alma mater, but I stand here nonetheless in support of our hometown Maryland Terrapins.

The season got off to a promising start with star player Greivis Vasquez electing to forego the National Basketball Association draft and play his senior year with the Terrapins. It proved to be a wise decision for him because Greivis went on to average 19.6 points per game during the season. He even scored a career-high 41 points in a single game. That was a rare feat for any basketball star. I know I was a fan. Throughout the season, Vasquez received the Atlantic Coast Conference Player of the Week honor four times and was unanimously selected first team All-ACC by the Atlantic Coast Sports Media Association. He led his team into the quarter-finals of the ACC tournament as the honored Atlantic Coast Conference Player of the Year, which he was named on March 9, 2010.

In 1967, while attending the University of Maryland, Coach Gary Williams played for the Terrapins—he wasn't coach then—and served as team captain. He returned to the University in 1989 to coach for the same team he once played for. It's been an honor to watch him, as Coach Williams has led his alma mater from a period of troubled times to an era of national prominence. He helped bring 13 NCAA tournament berths in the last 16 seasons,

seven Sweet Sixteen appearances, and in 2002, led the Terrapins to win the national title in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Championship. I know I, along with other Maryland Terrapin fans, followed that season and all the others, watching Gary Williams and sitting through the nail-biters in the stands. The opening of the 2009–2010 college basketball season marked the 21st season as head coach with the University of Maryland for Gary Williams. As a member of the University of Maryland's Alumni Hall of Fame, Coach Williams was named Atlantic Coast Conference Coach of the Year for the second time in his career, on March 9, 2010.

I wish to heartily congratulate Greivis Vasquez on being named the 2010 ACC Player of the Year; Coach Gary Williams on being named the 2010 ACC Coach of the Year; and the entire University of Maryland men's basketball team on a truly outstanding season. I wish them and my other favorite team, Wake Forest University, great success in the 2010 NCAA Tournament—the University of Maryland facing the University of Houston, and another Texas team, Texas, facing Wake Forest University. We all look forward to that, and we'll be cheering them on their way.

Again, congratulations to Coach Gary Williams and to Player of the Year Greivis Vasquez. Go Terps!

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1184, congratulating the 2009–2010 University of Maryland Men's Basketball Team, Greivis Vasquez, and Coach Gary Williams on an outstanding season. The University of Maryland Terrapins have had an outstanding season. The Terrapins completed the regular season with a 23–7 record and completed the Atlantic Coast Conference season with a 13–3 record. This year will mark its 24th tournament appearance, and I extend my congratulations to the University of Maryland; Head Coach Gary Williams and his staff; the hardworking players, especially Greivis Vasquez; and the fans. I wish them all well and wish them continued success, except there are several Kentucky teams that will be playing, so I obviously have to support my team.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield 1 minute to the House majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Go Terps! And they did. I'm a graduate of the University of Maryland. Like so many others, I am very proud of my alma mater. I went there many, many years ago. I have owned a number of homes throughout my life, but one of them was three doors from Gary Williams. I've known Gary Williams for all the time he's been at the University of Maryland, which is now over 20 years. Gary Williams is an extraordinary individual, an extraordinary coach, and has

had great success at every school he's coached at throughout this country. He's been at Maryland for, as I said, over two decades. He's the most winning coach in Maryland history. Lefty Driesell was his predecessor—not immediate predecessor, but in terms of holding that record. Lefty did a great job at the University of Maryland.

□ 1800

Maryland was picked very low in the ACC standings at the beginning of this season. The expectations were not high. The University of Maryland team had a freshman strong forward. So it was perceived that inside, they wouldn't have the kind of game they needed to compete in a conference like the Atlantic Coast Conference, which we, of course, in the ACC believe is the best conference in the United States, although I want to observe, it may not have been the best conference this year in the United States; but over the years, it certainly has been. But there were some very strong conferences. Not to forget to mention the Big East, it is pretty strong itself. But in any event, we weren't picked very high.

The reason Gary Williams has been chosen appropriately for the honor of being Coach of the Year in the ACC, which has some extraordinary coaches, like Coach Krzyzewski, Coach Roy Williams at the University of North Carolina, and other great coaches, is because he took a team that did not have high expectations from the public and took it to a tie with Duke, one of the great teams in this country, to lead the ACC. They both finished 13-3, I believe, in the ACC.

Wake Forest, a great team as well. I want to thank the gentlelady from Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS, who shares Prince George's County in which University of Maryland College Park is located, for her gracious congratulations. She gives me a hard time. Wake beat us this year, and I don't know whether we'll meet again this year, probably not. But notwithstanding that, I appreciate her gracious support of this resolution.

I want to tell you that we have a young player. He is a senior. His name is Greivis Vasquez. Greivis Vasquez is a real personality on the court. Greivis Vasquez was the high scorer, picked as Player of the Year in the ACC, and was an extraordinary leader of our team on the floor. He was the spark plug of our team.

And when our team was down and needed to get up, needed to be inspired, it was Greivis Vasquez who, along with some other extraordinary players—and we had nine or 10 players who could have started at some other teams, frankly, wonderful players. Some, Jordan Williams, our new freshman who is going to be an extraordinary sophomore, and hopefully we may even keep him until his junior year.

But that is why we prevailed in the ACC. That's why we're going to prevail in the NCAA. We play Houston, as

you've heard. I'm sure I will talk to the Representatives from the Houston area about this game, coming up Friday at 9:50 p.m. We will focus on that game, and we'll talk to you a little bit about what you think and what we think. But it's going to be an excellent year.

But notwithstanding that, I was in Atlanta when the University of Maryland won the national championship. We played Indiana that year. I want to personally congratulate my friend Gary Williams on the great coaching job he did this year. I want to congratulate the entire team for the great job they did, and I want to wish them the very best of luck in the NCAA tournament.

I thank the gentlelady, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this resolution to the floor to appropriately recognize a great year for a great team, a great coach and a great ACC player of the year.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this resolution. I don't mean to cast any aspersions on the gentleman's alma mater, nor on any Terp fans or anything like that. But we're having a discussion this week, a lot about health care. And there's a lot of discussion on the government-run health care bill about fairness and equity in the process.

I would like to point out a little bit about the fairness and equity of the process of this resolution. Back last October, I authored a similar resolution—we all often do these things—for a university in my district, the University of California at Irvine, also known as UCI, whose men's volleyball team won the championship. They didn't just make the playoffs. They won the national championship. And the majority leader, whose bill this is, pulled that resolution from the floor. So he did not allow that resolution last October to be heard. Therefore, those kids who won that national championship were not able to get the same recognition that apparently today these players for Maryland, who are just in the playoffs, are going to receive.

Second of all, Mr. Speaker, in the past, we have done these for teams that win national championships. This is for a team that's making the playoffs, one of 65. Now, there are a lot of people out there, Mr. Speaker, who believe that we're wasting the taxpayers' money and the taxpayers' time by doing these sorts of resolutions. There's an argument for that. There is also an argument to be made that it's a great thing for the kids who win these to have these additional resolutions to put in their trophy case.

But the one thing I do believe is that we shouldn't descend into doing everyone that wins that gets into a playoff. That would be 65 teams just here in

men's basketball. And think of all the men's and women's sports that are out there and how many teams that would include if we begin to do that as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have here the sports section from today's Washington Post. I will read from the front page where it says that according to a study, Maryland had the lowest graduation rate, 8 percent, among the 65 NCAA tournament teams. Given that this is being put forth in the Education and Labor Committee, if we were going to look at all the 65 teams in the NCAA championships, should we be considering the academics of the teams that are in or not in?

Mr. Speaker, and to the majority leader, I don't like doing this. I can see the banter going on. These things are usually fun. They're usually easy. But it seems like in this House recently, we have lost a sense of equity and fairness in the process. It seems like if a school is represented by someone from the minority party, they don't get a recognition, whereas, perhaps if they're from the majority, they do. It seems like there are different thresholds, different standards, different ways that things happen in this House rather than a simple equity and fairness.

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution, and I would encourage my colleagues to oppose it, again, not to cast any aspersions on the University of Maryland but to send a message that process matters and that the way fairness and equity matters, and little things like this aren't nearly as important as big things like the government-run health care bill that we're doing this week. But the fact is that this little bit is endemic of what is going on in the bigger bills in this House in the way it operates and the way it has, unfortunately, in this Congress.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I will keep myself totally neutral as a graduate of the University of New Hampshire.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1184.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND HEALTH CARE

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that millions of Americans are waiting desperately for Congress to act on health care reform and higher education reconciliation legislation. As Chair of the Higher Education, Lifelong Learning, and Competitiveness Subcommittee, I call on my colleagues in the House to put the uninsured and our students and families first. The Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, known as SAFRA, H.R. 3221, which we passed in the House last September, must be included as part of the final health care reconciliation legislation. SAFRA makes the single largest investment in college financial aid in history. It's bigger than the GI Bill. It expands accessibility and affordability in higher education by investing tens of billions of dollars in Pell grants, building a world-class community college system, strengthening early educational programs, and making landmark investments of \$2.55 billion in Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, tribally controlled colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues in the Tri-Caucus in urging the House and Senate leadership to maintain the investments for Minority-Serving Institutions in the final reconciliation bill. This legislation is an investment in the "future of our country!"

Through the government's Direct Loan program, SAFRA will make college loans more affordable for students and families.

I urge my colleagues to make the right choice for millions of students, families, and uninsured residents who need our help to improve their lives. Vote for Health Care and Higher Education Reconciliation Legislation.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RIGHT OF PRIVACY WILL BE STOLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are told that we must immediately pass this government takeover of health care or there will be health care panic in the streets. Now, we know the real reason this bill is being rushed to passage, even though no one has had time to read it. According to the Speaker, as quoted, "We have to pass this bill so that you can find out what is in it." Let me repeat what the Speaker said: "We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it."

After all, it's 2,700 pages long, and it's just too long to find out what's in

it before we vote on it. So now we know, it has to be voted on so it can be read. I guess if Members read the whole bill before they voted, they might actually vote it down.

But there's one thing that we do know that's in this bill, and it is that it steals the right of privacy for all Americans. It will invade people's legal right to medical privacy. The government gets control over everybody's health care information, and it's another reason why we should oppose the bill. The government has no business sticking its nose into people's medical records. It's none of the government's business. The bill creates a health care integrity data bank where the Feds have access to everybody's medical records. Health care information is supposed to be between the patient and the doctor, not the patient and some yet unnamed, anonymous, unaccountable Federal bureaucrat hiding somewhere in this building.

When the government has everybody's medical records, they are at risk for misuse. Giving government bureaucrats' access to people's most private and intimate health information means their health records become public property. People's most intimate private health care information, warts and all, becomes the property of the U.S. Government. The Federal Government grab of health care will eliminate any masquerade of medical privacy.

The 111 new Federal agencies in this bill, that we have yet to read, will be snooping through your records. Talk to your doctor, and the government will know what you said. You've got some type of illness or disease, well, the government's going to know about it. Feeling a bit depressed after a family death and need some medication? Well, the government will even know your mental health issues. Now, is this the kind of information that should be in the hands of Federal bureaucrats, a bunch of busybody bureaucrats bestowed with the task to go forth and do good to the people?

The famous author C.S. Lewis once said, "Of all the tyrannies, a tyranny exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber barons' cruelty may sometimes sleep, but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end."

□ 1815

See, don't worry, the bureaucrats will boast. It's for your own good that we know this information. It won't hurt too much.

Once medical records are available to the Feds, every government agency will want to get their hands on those private medical records. That's just the way those bureaucrats work. And every American will be required to be a part of the Big Brother health care database.

People won't talk to their doctor anymore about their problems. They'll know somewhere in the deep, dark, dank dungeons of Washington, D.C., a Federal bureaucrat will be reading and perusing their medical records.

This is an invasion of privacy, and it violates the U.S. Constitution. The whole scheme denies individual liberty when the government takes over health care.

Thomas Jefferson even talked about universal health care once. He said: If the people let government decide what foods they eat and what medicines they take, their bodies will soon be in as sorry a state as are the souls of those who live under tyranny.

When government takes over health care, it will equalize poor health for everybody. The government takeover of health care is not about health and it's sure not about care. It's about government control of our personal lives. And this legislation violates our U.S. Constitution because it steals the right of privacy right from underneath us, all in the name of taking care of us.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE SENATE MUST PASS THE JOBS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on the United States Senate to follow the House's lead and pass the jobs bill. The House passed the HIRE Act last week, and now the Senate needs to send it to the President for his signature. Americans need jobs and we need them now.

My constituents tell me they want Congress to quit the bickering and the partisan posturing and get to work and fix the economy. Wall Street may be doing well enough for the bankers to reward themselves with big bonuses, but folks on Main Street are still hurting.

North Carolina's unemployment rate has been above 11 percent for too long, and some counties in my congressional district are experiencing unemployment as high as 14.6 percent. More than half a million North Carolina workers are unemployed according to the new figures released by the Employment Security Commission.

I've said before and I'll say it again, my top priorities of what we need to be doing are jobs, jobs, jobs. The jobs bill will provide the incentive companies need to put people to work today, giving employers a tax credit for every new worker they hire.

I recently visited with local business leaders at the Erwin Chamber of Commerce as well as the Benson Chamber of Commerce, and they told me that this is the kind of Federal assistance that they need to help jump-start hiring in their communities. I think that's true not only in North Carolina, but across the country, and Congress needs to take action on jobs now.

The centerpiece of the jobs bill that the House passed last week is a hiring tax credit, similar to the one I proposed in my *HIRING Act of H.R. 4437*. The bill would encourage business to invest by putting labor on sale for a limited time, helping small businesses expand and grow.

The bill provides a payroll tax holiday to businesses that hire unemployed workers that is estimated to support roughly 300,000 jobs and encourage employers to keep those workers longer term so they will receive a tax credit of \$1,000 if they retain them.

The jobs bill we passed last week also included another proposal of mine—to support local school construction building by providing a tax credit for Qualified School Construction Bonds that were included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act last year. It will allow the issuers of Qualified School Construction Bonds to receive a direct payment from the Federal Government equal to the amount of the Federal tax credit.

This modification will help North Carolina schools access nearly \$500 million in school construction bonds to address our students' needs and support more than 15,000 jobs just in North Carolina. You can imagine what it would do for the rest of the country.

Last week I visited a school in Franklin County that was being built in my district from the first piece of these School Construction Bonds, and it's amazing to see what it does for a community and how it gives them an uplift.

This provision will create jobs now, building the schools of the future. It's a win-win that makes sense, and I urge the Senate to pass the *HIRE Act* now. It'll be like CPR for our economy, and I hope the Senate will join the House in getting it done.

CORPORAL DUSTIN LEE MEMORIAL ACT

The *SPEAKER pro tempore*. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 4639, the Corporal Dustin Lee Memorial Act. What this bill would do is allow the adoption of military working dogs by the family of a deceased or seriously wounded member of the Armed Forces who was the dog's handler.

And, Mr. Speaker, beside me I have the poster of a family from Mississippi whose son was killed for this country, Dustin Lee. He was a dog handler in

Iraq. He was killed by a rocket-propelled grenade, and his dog, Lex, was wounded.

The Marine Corps very kindly, at the funeral of Dustin Lee, carried Lex to be there with his master, and the family, Jerome, the daddy, and the mom, Rachel, asked the Marine Corps to please let the dog stay with them. The dog had two more years of service.

This was brought to my attention. I called a very dear friend of mine, General Mike Regner, who's now in Afghanistan, told him the situation and said, Mike, is there anything we can do to help the Lee family adopt this dog, Lex?

And so, long story short, Mr. Speaker, the Marine Corps contacted the Air Force, and the adoption took place 2 years ago in Albany, Georgia.

I have beside me a photograph taken by the family. Lex, the dog, is looking at the headstone that's got an engraving of Dustin Lee and Lex, and it says, "In loving memory of Corporal Dustin Jerome Lee."

Mr. Speaker, what happened was as soon as they got the dog home, Lex, the German Shepherd, they allowed Lex to sniff the boots of their son, Dustin, who had been killed, and then they took Lex to the cemetery. I've seen photographs of the cemetery. It's a rather large cemetery. And they took the dog, Lex, away from the area, then they let him out and said, Find Dustin; find Dustin. And the dog ran up to the headstone and laid down.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in this effort to allow a family of a deceased soldier, marine, airman, whomever, that maybe was a dog handler who was killed for this country, or the seriously wounded soldier, marine or airman or seaman who was wounded be able to adopt the dog without going through a long process.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again will ask my colleagues to please join us in H.R. 4639.

And before I close, as I always do on the floor of the House, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in his loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for this country. And I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama, that he will do what is right for the people of this country.

And three times I will say, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

The *SPEAKER pro tempore*. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HEALTH CARE REFORM IS NOT AN INVASION OF PRIVACY

The *SPEAKER pro tempore*. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, we heard one of the most outrageous charges I've seen in many, many days and heard in many days around here concerning the health care bill. The notion that somehow the health care bill overrides the HIPAA law that's more than a decade over is foolish nonsense.

The privacy remains for every individual in America under the HIPAA law, and in no way does the health reform bill invade or change in any way the HIPAA law, which provides privacy on all medical records, whether they are with your local doctor, the clinic, the hospital, the Federal Government. Whether you are on Medicare, Medicaid, or whatever program you are in, your privacy is assured by a decade-old law. And what will be before us in the days ahead is a change not in the HIPAA law, but in other sections of the laws pertaining to health care in America.

There is absolutely no truth whatsoever that the privacy of individuals are in any way changed by the bills that we will be taking up in the days ahead.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM

The *SPEAKER pro tempore*. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Iran's nuclear program is progressing at a rapid pace, and absent swift action, Iran could soon build a nuclear bomb, putting the United States, Israel, and the entire Middle East at risk. The need for Congress to pass strong and comprehensive sanctions against Iran is urgent.

Iran currently possesses enough low-enriched uranium to produce two nuclear weapons upon further enrichment. Last month, Iran began enriching the stockpile of low-enriched uranium to a level of 20 percent under the guise of needing more highly enriched uranium for medical purposes; yet the truth is that Iran lacks the technical know-how to turn 20 percent enriched uranium into fuel rods needed to produce medical isotopes.

Rather than meeting its medical needs, this step only puts Iran that much closer to having weapons-grade fuel that could be turned into a nuclear weapon. In fact, nuclear experts say this level of enrichment represents 85 to 90 percent of the work needed to produce weapons-grade fuel. Allowed to continue on this course, Iran could potentially complete the enrichment process in a few months at a small facility, according to former IAEA action team member and physicist David Albright.

The IAEA has also recently raised new concerns about the military nature of Iran's nuclear program. In February, the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency issued a report that said Iran may be working to develop a nuclear-armed missile, adding further evidence that Iran's nuclear work is not for peaceful purposes.

If Iran is successful in building a nuclear weapon and fitting it into a missile, the entire region will be at risk. Iran already has missiles with a range of more than 1,200 miles, which puts Israel, Iraq, Turkey, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt, and the Ukraine and many other countries within striking distance.

Advancements in Iranian technology threaten nations further away from Iran as well. Iran has launched a satellite into space, demonstrating that it has the technical capability that may allow it to build ballistic missiles capable of hitting American cities.

While nuclear proliferation is dangerous in any context, there is greater reason to be gravely concerned about a nuclear-armed Iran. For years, Iran has fought American presence in the Middle East and has supported terrorist groups that have targeted and killed American troops. For example, American officials believe Iran supported the group behind the 1996 terrorist attack on a U.S. military residence in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 of our servicemen. A nuclear-armed Iran would surely put American troops serving in the Middle East today at even greater risk.

In addition, Iran's leaders frequently speak of a world without Israel. The Iranian President has called for Israel to be "wiped off the map." If Iran gets a nuclear weapon, its leader will have the capability to do these hateful, destructive things that they speak of.

Americans and Israelis around the world would also be at likely greater risk of a terrorist attack if Iran obtains the bomb. Iran is already the leading state sponsor of terrorism, funneling money, weapons, and training to terrorist groups, including Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist organizations. These groups have goals and ideologies inconsistent with our American values. Emboldened by a nuclear-armed Iran, they may launch even more frequent and deadly attacks on innocent civilians.

□ 1830

Clearly, the consequences of a nuclear-armed Iran are intolerable. To stop Iran's drive to a nuclear weapon, we must act now and we must act decisively. The House of Representatives and the Senate have both passed legislation to impose strong and comprehensive sanctions on Iran. The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act and the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act target Iran's reliance on foreign suppliers to meet its fuel needs. Although Iran sits on top of a wealth of oil and nat-

ural gas, it lacks the ability to turn much of that oil into gasoline. Consequently, Iran imports 40 percent of its gasoline needs.

The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act and the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act offer the best prospect of compelling Iran to give up its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Congressional leaders must quickly resolve the differences between the House and Senate versions of these bills while keeping the teeth of the sanctions intact so the President can sign a final bill into law.

At the same time, the administration and like-minded allies should impose multilateral sanctions now while also pressing reluctant nations to agree to strong and comprehensive sanctions at the United Nations. The administration must also enforce current law and levy sanctions against companies that violate our laws.

Time is not on our side. The sooner strong and comprehensive sanctions are applied on Iran the greater chance we have of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, saving the lives of many, and enhancing the security of our own and that of our allies in the region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CREATING AMERICAN JOBS THROUGH TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Ambassador Kirk will meet behind closed doors with the House Ways and Means Committee. While I appreciate the meeting, why do congressional Democrats refuse to talk in the open about creating jobs through international trade? I am encouraged by the administration's newfound openness to promoting American goods and services overseas, but the current situation is bleak. Nearly one in 10 Americans who want work cannot find a job.

The recent economic downturn erased the certainty many families came to rely on, and now they turn to Washington for solutions. Unfortunately, a health care overhaul with new mandates, energy taxes that will drive up input costs, and a massive Tax Code full of quirks and loopholes add to

their doubts. To truly grow American jobs, entrepreneurs and businesses need new markets where they can compete to sell their products. We must restore American competitiveness to create new jobs and a prosperous future.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers living outside the United States, our ability to compete fairly and successfully in these markets is vital to our long-term economic growth and security. As the President said last week, "We need to compete for those customers because other nations are competing for them."

Today almost one in five U.S. jobs is supported by international trade. I welcome President Obama's lofty goal of doubling U.S. exports in the next 5 years through his National Export Initiative, and I look forward to discussing his plans with Ambassador Kirk.

As our economy continues to struggle, it is evident Americans will not be able to consume their way out of this recession, so we must focus on getting our products and services to emerging markets around the world. American ingenuity, creativity, and innovation can spur new jobs and new factories all right here at home.

According to the Obama administration, increasing trade by merely 1 percent would create 250,000 jobs, a significant start to helping Americans find work. Passing the Colombia, Panama, and South Korea Free Trade Agreements would accomplish just that, increasing our trade exports by 1 percent and creating an estimated 250,000 Americans jobs. These free trade agreements put American workers on a fair footing with workers in those countries instead of alienating our global trading partners through narrow-minded policies such as Buy American.

Now American-produced goods face substantial tariffs in Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, while many goods produced in those countries have no tariff at all when sold to the U.S. The President's goal is ambitious, so passing these three free trade agreements is an important first step to restoring American competitiveness in global markets.

The last time the U.S. doubled its exports, it took nearly 10 years: final implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, nine bilateral free trade agreements, and the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round. Since 1994, Louisiana has increased its exports to NAFTA countries by 271 percent. As a result, thousands of Louisiana workers have job stability, but we can do much more.

Trade creates good-paying jobs for millions of Americans, and leveling the playing field abroad increases our opportunities. Truly supporting American workers and creating new jobs will not be accomplished by closing our doors to the rest of the world while they continue to strike new deals and expand their exports. Now is the time to reach and to work with our allies

and major trading partners. American leadership is in jeopardy, not because of a rising power but because of a shrinking level of American engagement. The world will not wait for us to wake up and realize the opportunities out there. That is why we need to act on expanding these trade agreements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, actually my main subject I want to cover tonight is Israel, but I didn't want today to pass again without making comments about the health care bill, because clearly that is the number one subject on the minds of the people in Indiana as well as the rest of the country.

One of the things that has happened here, without getting into what I believe are the demerits of the bill, the 17 percent of the American economy, and many companies in my district are threatened and their choices threatened, but I think one of the frustrations here is the arrogance of the process.

Initially, we were promised that it was going to be live on C-SPAN and we would see all the negotiations. We are all familiar with how that was abandoned. Then many Members refused to do town halls. They wouldn't answer phone calls. They still won't answer their phone calls or mail. Then we saw deals made in the Senate bill unprecedented in American history.

As I pointed out earlier today, Thomas Jefferson got all of 13 States as part of the first Louisiana Purchase in inflation-adjusted dollars of \$150 million. Buying one vote from Louisiana in the other body cost \$300 million.

Then when 17 percent of the American economy is at stake, not some annual budget process but 17 percent of the American economy, the Founding Fathers had set up a process in the Senate that is being abused to go down to where it is 50 plus the Vice President can pass the bill. Now we are going to apparently pass this in the House, if they have the votes, and it is going to be deemed passed. We are not even going to vote. No wonder so many American people are losing confidence in government. It wasn't that we were high before, but we have hit new lows. And it is going to be difficult to establish confidence with the American people if we continue at this pace.

But another part of the arrogance of this government is happening in Israel.

I would like to insert this article from the Jerusalem Post into the RECORD. It is an article that makes some nuanced points.

But first let me start and say Israel has an historic importance to the world and to ourselves not just because of its history before the Diaspora and the tremendous history of the Jewish people and the Nation of Israel, but also it was a returning homeland for those after the Holocaust from around the world where they could gather again to the land from which they had been evicted.

Then it is important because it is a democratic bastion in the Middle East, where there are not democratic bastions. We are trying to see if Iraq can form a democracy, and Turkey is kind of a democracy as well. But Israel has been from its founding such a democracy, since its refounding in 1948. Not only that, but they are our best and really only consistent ally in the Middle East. But it is also because Israel is going to be of importance in future world history as well in many ways. In fact, not only should all Americans be concerned about what is happening in Israel, but many people have special concerns about the future of Israel and how the United States responds to Israel.

Therefore, it is extremely disturbing to watch the arrogance of this administration to bully our best ally. This article in the Jerusalem Post says this is the worst that the United States has treated Israel since 1975. The American leadership is mistakenly painting Israel into a corner is the thrust of this article. In one of the more sophisticated statements in it by Mr. Avner, who has written on the '75 crisis, he said, "If the United States wishes to advance a peace process, it must never paint Israel into a corner." And he points out that what is needed is constructive ambiguity.

Now, that is an interesting term because most of us like to be very forthright. And I would say that most people in Israel would like to be forthright most of the time. But when dealing with historic conflicts that have gone back to how the divisions first occurred in what I believe when God gave Israel its land, and divisions that have occurred since then, straightforwardness does not bring peace. Constructive ambiguity brings peace.

So when the United States takes sides in calling Ramat Shlomo a settlement, they chose words that were from the other side. That sends a message that becomes then very difficult for Israel. The question is, have we switched our positions or are we not as fully behind Israel?

Now, anybody who has ever visited there, reads about it, follows Israel, realizes that its enemies on all sides at least claim they want to destroy it. And from time to time they have had wars with which to attempt to destroy it. You don't have to be kind of really informed on international issues to re-

alize that Iran is trying to develop a nuclear bomb. Why are they trying to develop a nuclear bomb? They want to destroy Israel from the face of the earth. It is their stated goal.

Now, the people in Israel may be divided on a lot of things and they have a lot of opinions in their country, but they are a tad worried about Iran. And they believe that the United States and the rest of the world don't seem to be taking it as seriously as they do. Maybe because, for example, you can get a bomber over Jerusalem from Amman, Jordan, in a minute and a half. So they tend to be a little uncertain when there is some doubt. And so they have a deep concern. In this case they have a concern that we are all going to talk, talk, talk while they are going to be in danger because of a nuclear weapon. If we are going to address this, we need to stop giving the signals that we do not stand behind Israel, and we need to stand directly behind Israel and let the world know that is what our U.S. position is and do a little bit of constructive ambiguity.

OBAMA REPEATING 1975 MISTAKES

(By Gil Hoffman)

EX-RABIN ADVISER SAYS US GOVERNMENT'S STANCE RECALLS US-ISRAEL SINAI CRISIS.

The American leadership is mistakenly "painting Israel into a corner," as it did during a 1975 confrontation between the two countries, Yehuda Avner, who was an adviser to then-prime minister Yitzhak Rabin at the time of the crisis, said Monday.

Ambassador to the US Michael Oren was quoted as telling Israeli consuls general on a conference call Saturday night that the current crisis with the US was the worst since the 1975 confrontation between then US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Rabin over an American demand for a partial withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula.

Avner said he did not have enough inside information about the current crisis to compare the two. But he compared the language of Kissinger 35 years ago to that of current US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who he said spoke in a manner that was more emotional than diplomatic.

"The US must never create a situation in which Israel sees itself as being abandoned, because it encourages belligerence on the other side and inflexibility on the Israeli side," Avner said. "If the US wishes to advance a peace process, it must never paint Israel into a corner as it did by calling Ramat Shlomo a settlement. What's needed now on all sides is constructive ambiguity."

Avner, who worked under four Israeli prime ministers, recalled the details of the 1975 crisis, which he recounts in his new book *The Prime Ministers*.

He said the March 1975 incident erupted when Kissinger demanded that Israel give up the Jidda and Mitla passes in the Sinai, and Rabin refused. Because of his refusal, Kissinger left a meeting with Rabin in anger and accused Israel of "shattering the cause of peace."

At the height of the confrontation between the two men, Kissinger told Rabin: "You will be responsible for the destruction of the third Jewish commonwealth," and Rabin replied, "You will be judged not by American history but by Jewish history." Avner said he hoped the current crisis would be resolved as successfully.

Then American president Gerald Ford wrote Rabin a fiercely worded letter that

Avner said was among "the most brutal" Israel had received from the US.

"I wish to express my profound disappointment of Israel's attitude over the course of the negotiations," Ford wrote. "You know the importance I have attached to the US efforts to reach an agreement. Kissinger's mission, encouraged by your government, expresses vital US interests in the region. Failure of the negotiations will have a far-reaching impact on the region and our relation. I have therefore instructed that a reassessment be made of US policy in the region, including our relations with Israel with the aim of reassuring that our overall American interests are protected."

Within six months, Kissinger succeeded in brokering an interim accord between Rabin and Egyptian president Anwar Sadat whereby Israel agreed to pull back its forces out of the Jidda and Mitla passes but retained the heights above them while American forces were stationed in the passes.

Avner said that since that compromise was reached, no Israeli has been killed on the Israel-Egypt border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CAPITO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEMOCRATIC SMALL BUSINESS AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, I look forward tonight in this next hour to discuss the Democratic small business agenda, one that I believe will really help to bring our country further out of the recession that we are now climbing out of. I am glad that some of my colleagues are able to join me tonight as we talk about this agenda going forward.

As our country struggles to overcome the effects of the financial crisis and economic recession, we must look for innovative ways to help create new jobs and foster private sector growth. We must act aggressively to counter

the job losses of the past 2 years. And those job losses have been great. More than 8 million jobs have been lost since the recession began in late 2007. Our Nation's unemployment rate is near 10 percent, and in many areas well above 10 percent. Job losses are on the decline, which is good news amidst so many months of recession, but we still have a very long way to go.

The number of long-term unemployed individuals in the United States is extremely high, totaling 6.1 million people as of last month. That is 6.1 million people who have been out of work for 27 weeks or longer. That is nearly 7 months of unemployment. And approximately 2.5 million people are considered marginally attached to the labor force, meaning they want work, but because the job market is so uninviting they have not looked for work in the last 4 weeks.

One of our Nation's greatest historical strengths has always been our optimism. But when faced with a long-term, gradual recovery, as we are today, it is understandable that patience wanes and it becomes difficult to retain the optimism that has served us so well in the past. That is why we must act aggressively and decisively to help our private sector grow and create jobs.

I believe the best place to start is the area of our economy that has the greatest record of success in creating jobs, and that is our small business sector. As a former small business owner—my husband is still running the business—I have seen firsthand the power of small businesses in our communities. A grocery store can transform an urban landscape, improve the health and lower crime in neighborhoods that others may have thought was a lost cause. A retail store or restaurant can energize a community by drawing patrons to lesser traveled areas. A small business can turn an empty street into a destination for customers and tourists. Manufacturers and producers can create hubs of commerce and employment when the jobs they create directly beget indirect jobs.

□ 1845

Manufacturers need supplies and equipment to create their products, and their workers need a place to eat lunch and to shop.

When small businesses grow and prosper, their communities reap the benefits. Small businesses are the engine of economic growth and job creation in the United States, and they've been for years. Over the last 15 years, small businesses have created over 65 percent of the Nation's new jobs, approximately 14.5 million jobs. Small businesses represent 99.7 percent of all employer firms. That means less than 1 percent of our employers are big corporations.

Small businesses are the starting point for economic success. The small businesses of today are the success stories of tomorrow. It's small businesses

that create the technologies that profoundly affect our lives and our culture—medical devices that regulate heartbeats, software that allows us to connect with people across the globe, products that rid our ground water of arsenic. These are just a few of the examples of innovations of small businesses.

The American entrepreneurial spirit will help drive our economy out of recession, creating jobs in innovation along the way. That is why we must do all we can to help businesses, small businesses, grow and prosper.

I would now like to yield to my good friend, Mr. TONKO from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you for bringing us together this evening for this discussion on the small business agenda here in Washington.

Obviously, as has been stated so many times during this session of Congress, the number one priority is jobs, jobs, jobs, and jobs. We cannot overemphasize the impact that job creation, job retention bears on the discussions that we have here in restoring this Nation's economy.

And you make a very valid point in assessing the very deep loss of jobs that we experienced at the beginning of this administration. It was somewhere in the neighborhood of 700,000 to 750,000 jobs lost per month in the last 3 or 4 months before the Obama administration began its work here in Washington. That was a tremendous loss to this Nation's economy. Millions upon millions, 7 to 8 million jobs lost during this recession. A very painful blow to the American economy and certainly to the American households across this Nation.

And as we look forward to progress to inspire us, it is good to note that while it's not good enough, some 200,000 to 300,000 jobs lost in the last few months is a vastly improved outcome, a long way to go, but moving in the right direction. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act enabled us to place down payments in small business production and creation and retention. Certainly those efforts are coming in cutting-edge fashion where we're now addressing job growth in a way that speaks to research and development, allowing us to spark an innovation economy that enables us to respond in very valid terms by embracing our intellectual capacity as a Nation.

These are the source of efforts that require our investment. And I am so impressed that we can move forward now with many issues that were backburned.

When we look at the need to produce here locally in this country, to produce nationally for our energy needs, nothing could be smarter than to move forward with a clean energy economy, to be able to draw down that gluttonous dependency on fossil-based fuels that has fed this system, that has enabled us in a way to continue to add to that carbon footprint. And we're putting hundreds of billions of dollars per year

into the treasuries of unfriendly nations to the United States and our allies across the globe. That is not smart government. That is enabling us to continue along the course of status quo where we don't exercise the options available to us.

I look within my district. I look within the region that I represent and beyond in upstate New York, and there are such great things happening in nanoscience, in semiconductors, in superconductivity cable, in renewables, that we are now cultivating this climate that enables us to respond to a clean energy economy. It's growing our energy independence. It's growing our energy security, and therefore, favorably addressing our national security, because as we conduct these sorts of experiments and grow opportunities in the energy world, we are giving birth to wonderful startups, to entrepreneurs, and that is the spirit that is uniquely American, as you suggested.

So I'm very, very enthused about where we're heading. I believe that as we have stopped the bleeding of this recession, we now go forward with the toolkit that will enable our small business community to respond in fullest fashion where we embrace the intellect of this Nation and allow us again to taste that sense of pioneerism that is really, I think, the flame that really sparks America's comeback.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I think the gentleman makes a great point.

As you talk about the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, I think the part of that bill that we maybe fail to get the message out there about is the reinvestment side. In the beginning, we were trying to help those who were hurting most, those who needed extension of unemployment or needed help with COBRA. But now we see many of our small businesses are actually involved in the reinvestment side as we're actually reinvesting in our economy.

One of the exciting things I got to see was a new biomass heating unit for three different businesses. One is a school district-owned business, one is a recreation center, and one is a career center in one of my communities. And I asked them about the project, \$3.2 million project, \$500,000 of that coming from the Reinvestment Act. And I asked them how important that money was to them, and they said that was what they needed to get over the hump. This is going to create new jobs in our region on the construction side, and then jobs beyond that.

But our small businesses will be involved in putting this whole new system in, and it's going to actually save a lot of money for these three organizations in the long run and take us, as you say, to a cleaner economy as we go forward.

So there certainly are some very exciting things. Our agenda really started with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. And it is what has taken us out of the recession. And one

of the things we need to talk about is the aggressive agenda that we have, as Democrats, for small businesses, to give them the support they need to create jobs and speed the recovery.

And one of those is access to capital. I'm sure we all travel around our districts and hear from our small businesses that they can't get the capital they need. They want to grow their business. They see positive signs, and we need to be there. And our agenda, I think, is going to take them there. For every small business, they need capital to grow, and this is really the first piece of the puzzle. But the tight credit has limited their capacity. So we need to provide alternate means for small businesses to access capital to grow, and that's why we have a couple of different pieces of legislation.

One I have introduced, which is the Express Loans Improvement Act, H.R. 4598, to increase the availability and the utility of SBA express loans, a vital source of working capital for small businesses. And so I would certainly like to thank people who've come on that bill. And I want to thank particularly Congresswoman BEAN because she helped to introduce that legislation with me.

There are a number of other loans programs through the SBA that we're working to improve for our small businesses that will help them access the capital that will help them to grow.

Right now, I would like to yield to one of our newest Members from California, certainly a very welcome addition to our Democratic caucus and to Congress as a whole.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you. I want to thank the gentlelady from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York for the opportunity to discuss this critical issue of small business and jobs.

We know the statistics are very bad. But the discussion you two were having a moment ago used the word "investment." And we talked about the American Reinvestment Act. It's now 13 months old. And it's absolutely critical that we always ponder investment because the investments that we can make at the government level will lead to short-term job growth as well as to long-term job growth and stability.

Years ago, we looked in California about how do you grow the California economy. I did a report on it. This was more than 25 years ago. And we noted that the history of California's great economic growth was centered on five things. The first and foremost of them was the enormous investment that was made in education, both in K-12 and community colleges and in the research institutions. It was that investment that gave the foundation. And here we are today with enormous disinvestment, backing away from that critical investment in education.

Now, the legislation that we talked about, the American Reinvestment Act, moved billions of dollars into the education sector so that we can con-

tinue to educate our kids at the universities and K-12 and the community colleges so that people who had lost their jobs could come back and learn the new skills, as you were saying, Mr. TONKO, the new skills in the green technology. Extraordinarily important investment in knowledge, investment in the ability of people to compete internationally.

Our friends on the Republican side say, No, we shouldn't have done that. So what are these people to do? They have lost their job. They don't have the opportunity to get new knowledge and new skills.

The second thing that we learned that was one that you also just talked about, the two of you a moment ago, about the necessity for research. It is in the research that the new jobs are created. Why? Because those are new products. Those are things that people demand and want and need for the growing economy. And in that is the high profit margin. And, again, for the first time, the Democratic Congress and the President—without the help of the Republicans—passed the greatest increase in research money in the last 20 years, putting money into research that will again lead to jobs sooner and later as the economy grows.

There are many other pieces of this. One that's before us is the health care legislation. I know a young couple in their mid-thirties that want to start their own business but they cannot leave the job that they have today because they know that as small business people, they will not be able to get health care insurance. They have two kids.

So these are things that we're bringing to the American public—last year, with the American Recovery Act and now this year, as we look at how we're going to deal with health care. These are the critical investments that we need to make. And I thank you so very much for bringing this to our attention, to the attention of the American public.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I thank my friend from California.

Now I would like to yield to my friend from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Thank you for yielding the time. Thank you, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, for putting together and assembling this Special Order. And I would also like to thank Chairman LARSON, as well as Representatives SUTTON and HASTINGS, for chairing the House Jobs Task Force, of which I'm a member, and I think others are members of here tonight as well, which is doing very important work to make sure we are creating jobs in this country.

We all know that small businesses employ half of all private-sector employees, and are responsible for creating 60 to 80 percent of all new jobs over the last decade. They create more than half of our Nation's nonfarm GDP. Small businesses employ 40 percent of high-tech workers, and small businesses create 13 times more patents per

employee than large patenting firms. And improving access to credit is a key aspect of helping these small businesses grow and create jobs and ensure that America remains a global economic powerhouse.

I am pleased that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided \$30 billion in tax relief for small businesses and increased the percentage a business can write off in capital expenditures by 50 percent. Additionally, the total amount a business can write out has been doubled to \$250,000, allowing for a substantial investment in equipment and resources for small businesses.

But much more, as we know, much more needs to be done to help our small businesses in this country.

Last year, I had the opportunity to host a field hearing in Oakland County, Michigan, where I gave borrowers and lenders an opportunity to discuss the challenges that we're facing in Michigan. Bank regulators attended the hearing as well so that we could hear firsthand their policies and how those policies are making it very difficult for banks to make the loans to very worthy businesses in my State. And I know it's not just a problem in Michigan, but in States all across the country now.

One of the biggest problems that borrowers and lenders outlined was that as their value of commercial real estate, manufacturing equipment, and other sources of collateral has dropped, it has made it very difficult to obtain a line of credit. Even for a company that has purchase orders in hand, it is difficult for them to get that money. That's why I'm working with Congressman LEVIN and Congressman DINGELL on legislation that will provide States with funding that they can use to create a collateral support program to make sure that these businesses get the vital lending that is so important for them.

That's why I have also proposed a small business lending plan that will redirect unspent Wall Street bailout funding to instead help small businesses in our communities so they can get the credit that they need to grow and to create jobs.

□ 1900

Efforts to help small businesses are especially crucial in areas of high unemployment. I was happy to author legislation through the Small Business Committee which I know, Representative DAHLKEMPER, you are a leader in, to provide zero-interest loans worth up to \$75,000 to small businesses in high unemployment areas, with payment on these loans deferred for 18 months. It also makes high unemployment areas eligible for the New Market Venture Capital program, providing strong financial incentive for investment in new and emerging industries in areas where the workforce is necessary to build the new economy and is ready and enthusiastic and just needs that additional help.

In addition to helping businesses access capital, we must make sure that they also have access to key partnership programs that are proven to spur job creation. For example, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the MEP, is a crucial national program that provides technical services and assistance to increase productivity and efficiency of small and medium-sized businesses. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership is a model of an efficient and effective program, credited with creating and retaining over 55,000 jobs per year and \$10.5 billion in increased or retained sales.

MEP support is vital to the long-term success and competitiveness of small and medium-sized American businesses, and preserving and strengthening the program should be a priority as Congress continues to work on reviving this economy and getting that growth going.

Currently, the costs of the MEP's services are shared between the Federal Government, State government and industry with Federal Government contributing one-third, and States and industries contributing the remaining two-thirds. However, State budgets have threatened the MEP's existence, and at least 23 State MEP centers now report a decrease or elimination of State MEP funding in 2009 alone, and some centers have been operating without State assistance for years. When a State eliminates this vital funding, it is left to small businesses to cover the gap, and they risk losing Federal dollars in those States that are being hurt the worst. That is why I have introduced legislation with Representative EHLERS that would reduce the matching requirements for small businesses to ensure that they can continue to participate in this MEP program.

And, finally, I would like to also announce that this afternoon I introduced, along with Chairman LARSON and Congressmen REICHERT and TIBERI, a bill entitled the "American Job Creation Investment Act" to provide business tax relief projected to create hundreds of thousands of new jobs. I would like to thank my colleagues for working with me on this bill and support from those of you here in the Special Order here tonight as well.

This bill in a sense will allow companies to use the alternative minimum tax credits that they now hold but that otherwise they must save for future years to be used this year for job creation, job retention, and capital investments. The bill is estimated to directly create over 65,000 new jobs and help businesses retain 170,000 jobs in the next 2 years, plus spur \$40 billion in additional job-creating investment. A wide array of industry associations currently endorse the bill, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association, Associated Builders and Contractors Association, and the Association for Manufacturing Technology.

This is an incredibly efficient and commonsense way for us to spur job creation. Companies are sitting on these tax credits, but under current tax law cannot use them until future years. This bill will allow them to use the tax credits they have already accrued to create jobs now, when we need them the most. And I would like to encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this very important bill.

While I'm proud of the work that we have done in Congress to turn around our economy and help families and small businesses, I think we all agree that there is no question that there is more work to be done. Small businesses will be the key to my State's, and the entire Nation's, economic recovery. And I believe, as I know all of you believe, that helping businesses have access to capital that they need to grow, invest and create jobs is the key to helping our economy move and put Americans back to work. I look forward to continuing to work with all of you and applaud your efforts here tonight to bring this important issue to the American people as we continue to work to create jobs in this great country.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I thank my friend from Michigan who I know is just out there every day fighting for jobs in Michigan and fighting for this country to make sure that we have a robust and strategic plan going forward. And many of your pieces of legislation that you have brought forward will do that. I'm really glad you brought up MEP, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which I'm also a big fan of. I think that we need to make sure it is funded and funded in a way that our communities don't lose the funding if their States don't have the money. So I'm glad that you're working on that, and I appreciate your work in that area.

I'm also glad you brought up the Recovery Act tax relief. Again, there are so many parts about the Recovery Act that we don't talk about enough, and it gets stuck as "stimulus bill." I really like the "Recovery Act" name better. We need to talk about that recovery and reinvestment side, the tax relief that came to individuals, but the tax relief that came to small businesses to allow them to reinvest into their businesses continues on. And I think that is important not to forget those pieces.

I'm going to yield again to my friend from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative DAHLKEMPER. And it is a pleasure to hear both Congressmen from Michigan and California and you as a Representative from Pennsylvania all speaking the voice of the freshman class. I'm so enthused to work with all of us as freshman Members of this Congress. We have brought, I believe, a lot of thought, a lot of energy, a lot of vision; and we are attaching it to the leadership of this House, which is broken from some of the failed attempts from the prior administration.

The entire focus on manufacturing through the MEP program was denied. There wasn't a respect shown, I believe, strong enough toward the manufacturing sector. And the American manufacturing sector is alive. It will be competitive on the global scene because it can do it smarter, and the investment of that intellectual capacity of this Nation gives us great promise with the manufacturing sector.

So to hear of all these ideas, from tax benefits that will go toward creating small business opportunities, to dealing with the credit crunch, making certain that we raise the loan opportunities to allow for the working capital needs to be met for our small business community, those are important aspects. Those are great factors.

H.R. 4598, which you are sponsoring, Congresswoman, is tremendous benefit to the opportunities to invest in small business, and they are the backbone of this American economy.

To the gentleman from California, when he spoke of health care, I talked to a number of small businesses that might have five, 10, 15 employees. And when they are insuring their employees for health care purposes, they are looking over a rather small base. And the bill that we are looking at before the House allows for an exchange to be developed where there is a large pool of employees, where there is going to be a regulatory environment to hold down those costs. And beyond that, if you have one employee of five or 10 impacted with catastrophic illness, you're probably going to see rate increases in your insurance rise exponentially. When you put them into a larger sea of employees, by operating through these exchanges, that's the kind of reform that is responding to the needs of small business.

We talked about it today in my office. People understand that concept. You put people's situations into a large audience, and it neutralizes the outcome in a way that spreads the pain and allows small business to continue to provide for their employees, which they want to do. We have decided in this country we are going to stay with an employer-based health care system. So let's provide the reforms that allow small business to have the benefit in that outcome. If we profess small business to be the vision of the future, to be the job growth market, certainly we have seen it in the last decade or two, 75 to 85 percent of all the new jobs created are coming through small business.

So let's be there in a user-friendly way that allows them to provide for their employees so that they have a healthy and strong workforce so that we can put together both the physical health care, mental health care concepts that will enable them to prosper, put together the funding opportunities dealing with that credit crunch. We saw what happened. The banks were not regulated. We saw the institutions out there collapse. It killed the Amer-

ican economy and the global economy. And the credit lines were dried up. They were exhausted for households and businesses. That is not good.

So now it is our challenge as Democrats to respond; and, I think, in many dimensions we are responding. We are going to open those credit lines. We are going to provide for that capital need to be met for the business community. We are responding. And people need to know that it's a full agenda from a jobs package to health care reform to energy reform, which is growing a clean energy economy, an innovation economy. These are the concepts that are going to provide the change that was long overdue and utilize the American know-how, the great pioneer spirit.

I represent a host of communities, a necklace as I like to refer to it, of mill towns. They were the epicenters of invention and innovation. That spirit still prevails in this country today. And we need to foster that kind of growth. We need to grow out of this recession, now that we have stopped the bleeding, and build this economy the way we envision it to be the most powerful, with small business at the front and center of that.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I'm sure as the gentleman goes around his district, as my other colleagues do, and visits our small businesses, we see the innovation. It is exciting to go visit those small businesses in our region who are really doing some very amazing and innovative work.

Again, we have a robust and strategic agenda, the Democrats. And we have got to continue to work on this as we want to continue to help our small businesses. I think we have got a lot of good pieces in place and, as Mr. PETERS brought up, even more things that we are bringing forward.

I would like to yield again to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much for weaving together all the pieces of the puzzle that the Democratic Party and this Congress are putting together. It is the education piece, the health care piece, and also there is another piece, and I'm going to use an example here of what is taking place in one of the counties I represent. It's Contra Costa County and the Contra Costa Council, which is made up of businesspeople who have said, let's use the purchasing power of government to incentivize and to help the small businesses.

Now, it happens that in this particular area, there are major research institutions. The University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Lab, Lawrence Livermore Lab and the Sandia Lab are all in the area. And out of that comes enormous numbers of new ideas. But those ideas are often left without a real market because they are new and they haven't been able to grow and to develop their market. So the local government said, why don't we get together and become the purchaser and jump-start, use the pur-

chasing power of government, particularly in the area of energy conservation.

For example, street lights, there is a new company that is in the LED lighting system, and it's possible for that company, in their own neighborhood, to create a huge market, replacing the existing street lights. They use an enormous amount of energy with the new LED lights. But one example, in order to do that, that is the wise use of government. At the Federal level, billions upon billions of dollars are spent every year, often going to the large companies to what are known as the "Beltway Bandits," the companies that hover around Washington. We in the Democratic Party are doing this today, the Democratic Congress is pushing the President, pushing the administration to push those jobs back to the local community by contracting with small businesses.

The small business community needs access to the Federal contracts just as they would like to have access to the local government. That has been the policy of the Democratic Congress and is the policy of the Democratic President to make sure that small businesses have access to the Federal contracts. It doesn't come easy. I was the Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior in the 1990s, and we had to literally force the bureaucracies to contract with small business. It is like putting in reporting requirements. We are continuing that today.

So once again, there is a web of opportunities, education, health care, the tax laws, all of these things, including contracting and access to the Federal and local government purchasing power that creates opportunities for small businesses. That is our agenda, and it's a good agenda for America. It's a good agenda for business.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Another piece of the legislation that we have passed through the House and the Senate, I believe, is taking it up tomorrow, is the HIRE Act, or the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act, which includes tax cuts, again, for small businesses to invest, expand and hire more workers. It also takes on unemployment directly creating a payroll tax holiday for businesses that hire unemployed workers to create, we hope, some 300,000 jobs in our country and an income tax credit of \$100,000 for businesses that retain those employees. These tax cuts and credits are going to help our small businesses grow and push our unemployment rate down.

As I said, the Senate is considering this, I believe, tomorrow. So we will look forward to the Senate's passing that legislation and again getting that out to help our small businesses throughout this community.

As a consequence of our recession, small businesses are hesitant to invest in expansion in the current economic climate. So to encourage those investments, we must continue to offer those tax incentives to give our small businesses the comfort they need to have

to move forward and to grow their businesses, and, again, going back to making sure access to capital is there, the tax incentives, the MEP programs, even as our colleague from California talked about, the education facilities and making sure that there is a connection between our small businesses and our education institutes.

□ 1915

So that is an important piece that we can't forget about. There needs to be that good connection. I think many of our pieces of legislation are working to make sure that connection is there that wasn't always there. Sometimes there is a disconnect between what happens in the university setting and research and what happens in our manufacturing facilities. And I think we have worked really hard in some of our legislation, and we will again in our America Competes legislation that we are bringing now through the Science and Tech Committee that many of us sit on, we will be working to make sure that that connection is there. So it is another important piece.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me give you a very brief example of that connection.

The community colleges across this Nation are one of the very best places for people to get specific job training. When the community college is connected to the business communities, the business community can directly affect the educational program that that community college is providing, making the education pertinent to the employer so that when that employee finishes or when that worker finishes the community college program, they are specifically ready.

I was listening this last weekend when I was back in California to a local radio station talking about the way in which the community college and the employers are working together to educate unemployed construction workers, preparing them for the solar industry so that they knew how to install solar photovoltaic, so that they could be the salespersons, so that they can do the audits that are necessary, and those people would be immediately prepared. Now, the problem is the community colleges across this Nation are running out of money.

Now, Mr. MILLER, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, has proposed a new piece of legislation called the Local Government Jobs Act, and it has \$23 billion to directly go to the educational system so that they can hire the teachers, so that they can do the training in the community colleges to prepare workers for the new economy that is coming our direction. This is the kind of really important and useful legislation that is needed. Some 250,000 teachers would continue to be employed.

And I was noticing in the Washington Post today, the headlines, the right-hand column, "Thousands face furloughs; schools may lose millions." That is repeated. That same headline

was found in the Sacramento Bee and the Los Angeles Times in the last week.

So we need to support the educational system so that unemployed workers have the opportunity to become better prepared to take the jobs that will be there as these tax incentives, the new economy kicks in, as we move to the green technologies and the green energy systems. There is a totality here. There is a holistic approach.

That is what the Democratic agenda provides: tax incentives, health care, education, purchasing power of the government made available to small businesses, bringing the new businesses on line. All of these things create a totality that will restart our economy and keep us moving and take these workers that are now tax-takers on unemployment insurance, some on welfare, using the COBRA money that we provided through the American Recovery Act, and let them become taxpayers, building our economy once again. That is our agenda.

Thank you so very, very much for bringing this small business agenda to the American public so that they understand that this party, the Democratic Party, is the party that is concerned and is willing to use the power of government to restart our economy and to give small businesses an opportunity to prosper and grow.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I thank the gentleman from California, who I know is very passionate about these issues. And we really appreciate your joining us tonight and being part of this discussion.

I have said for years that a strong economy really begins with a strong education system. We have got to have our students ready. STEM education, all the different aspects of education need to be there to make a strong student base that will then go on and be our next innovators and our next scientists and our next artists, because we need all those different aspects of our culture.

We have been joined by another member of our freshman class, from Florida. So representing the southern part of our country, I would like to now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS).

Ms. KOSMAS. Thank you very much. I thank you for yielding and for hosting this important forum on small business.

I appreciate the picture that has been painted here on the large issues nationally and how they are affecting our economy, but I come to speak from a personal perspective as a person who has been a small business owner, self-employed my entire adult life. And that means that in my community, most of my friends and colleagues are also small business owners small- to medium-sized business owners, and I recognize the things that are important to them. We recognize them, of course, as the engines of our economy.

And what we know for sure is that, over the last decade, 70 percent of new

jobs created in this country have been created through small businesses. That is why they are so critically important to us during this economic time. We want to ensure that they are able to survive and thrive, and I think we all are working together in order to make that happen. We recognize that the Recovery Act has been important to these small businesses and that measures have been introduced to help them have access to loans and to capital, but I know that in my district and in others, businesses are still struggling in order to access the capital that they need in order to grow and add jobs.

Just last week, I visited VaxDesign, which is a truly innovative biotech company, in my district, that wants to expand; but in order to do so, they are going to need to attract resources. And so what we really need to do is to take additional steps to open up the flow of capital to small businesses, and that is why I have introduced a bill that will eliminate the capital gains tax on long-term investments in small business stock. We have done that so that innovative companies can attract the long-term investors that they need and grow new jobs. We all recognize that that is a very important part of what we are trying to do during this particular economic downturn.

As was previously stated by Representative DAHLKEMPER, the House has recently passed legislation that plays an important role in providing a payroll tax break for businesses and also a \$1,000 credit for keeping new hires on, and these are very important incentives.

I have also introduced several other measures that I think are extremely important based on my experience in small business and my recognition of the issues that are important to them in my district. Some of these include incentives to encourage private sector investment in areas of high unemployment, which is a serious problem in many districts but about 12 percent in parts of my district. And while we have had these incentives in place in the past for low-income areas, we are now wanting to apply those incentives to high-unemployment areas.

I have long suggested that we should allow sole proprietors of small businesses to be able to deduct the cost of their health care, which they are not currently able to do. This has the benefit, of course, of providing them with a tax incentive but also encouraging them to have health care for themselves and their families.

We have introduced legislation that increases the new business startup deduction from \$5,000 to \$20,000, and also a Shop Act which we introduced that allows small businesses to pool together to purchase insurance.

Some of these, of course, will be taken care of in other ways and through other pieces of legislation, but they are important initiatives that I have personally taken on as part of my own agenda for my district.

We also passed an amendment to support the photonics industry through the Small Business Innovation and Research Act, and this is very key to central Florida, an area where that area is growing rapidly.

These are some examples of what I call common sense, and they are bipartisan solutions that I believe will help our small businesses spur investments and create jobs. And it would be my intention to continue to work with my colleagues and to try to continue to find new ways to increase opportunities for small businesses to grow and to hire more folks in central Florida and across the country.

I certainly am proud to be here this evening and concur with, as I say, the big picture that you have painted as to how small business is connected to the educational system, and the opportunity for innovation that grows out of small business is a very important component of how we see improving our educational system at all levels.

So I thank you again for bringing this issue before us and for the opportunity to speak tonight.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I thank my friend from Florida for joining us. And one of the, I think, encouraging things that I have seen, we are all new Members here, but many of the new Members who came in in 2009 and also that came in in 2007 were small business owners at one point in their life and understand the issues that small businesses have to deal with. That actually gives great comfort to my small business owners back home when I tell them that we have actually started this Small Business Owners Caucus to talk about the issues from the small business owner perspective as we deal with legislation. And I think it is just important for people to understand the issues are different for small businesses than large businesses, and our agenda, the things that we have been talking about tonight, I think, bring forward the fact that we realize that and we are taking many steps here within our Democratic agenda to address those small business issues.

Mr. TONKO. Representative DAHLKEMPER, you know, you and our colleague from Florida sparked a thought as you were both talking about innovation and small business creation.

To the credit of the leadership in the House—and I have to credit Speaker PELOSI for really advancing the innovation economy. She believes in that investment. She understands that jobs are the greatest issue that are out there challenging this country in terms of providing the support that is required.

This Monday before I traveled here to the Nation's capital, while still in my district, I was invited to attend the 10th anniversary celebration of SuperPower, which is now producing all sorts of demonstrations in the high-temperature superconductive cable market.

As we talk about this energy system in our country, as we talk about cre-

ating our own American-produced supplies of power, we also need to remember there is a delivery system that needs our investment. The transmission and distribution system, the arteries and veins of the network, if you will, has been designed for monopoly settings. And as we have deregged in this industry, we now find that this country is not only wielding electrons from region to region but across State borders, across country borders as we look at importing power supplies from Canada.

So all that being said, the August 2003 failure that impacted the northeast of the United States, the eastern seacoast, States along the eastern seaboard, southeast Canada, millions, tens of millions of people in a blackout situation for days, if that didn't expose a gaping vulnerability of a weakness in this Nation, I don't know what would. So we need to invest in that delivery system. That is critical.

SuperPower, celebrating its 10th anniversary, is there producing high-temperature superconductive cable far more efficient than conventional cable where multiple times more electrons can be transmitted along the line.

As we look at the agenda in this country, there is no room for waste. I talked earlier about the gluttonous dependency on fossil-based fuels. If we can improve efficiencywise, we are going to be all the sounder as a Nation. So these great researchers and scientists are developing this cable.

They had in their display, at the Schenectady Museum for their 10th anniversary celebration, a piece of the cable that was used as a demonstration project in the city of Albany, New York, which proved successful. Now the work is to further develop so that we can commercialize this discovery and that we can drive down the cost so that it is truly an economic benefit. That is where R&D comes into play. It is all of that investment.

I truly believe that we, as a country, when investing in these efforts, create jobs from the trades on over to the Ph.D.'s. And when I looked at that, I realized that, here we have been investing. I was there at the front end of investment when we put down a bit of investment for capital purchases, for equipment for this startup. Now, 10 years later, they are doing great work. They are breaking their own records and are being recognized nationally and internationally.

So that has inspired me, along with conversations with small business innovators, entrepreneurs that are doing the same sort of signs and discovery that will change our response and responsiveness to a number of challenges out there.

I have introduced a bill that deals with the small business innovators. They are oftentimes in situations, scenarios that are high risk but high reward. And the angel network and the venture capital community even in this tough economy, especially in this

tough economy, is somewhat skittish about going out there, lending to them on their own.

□ 1930

So government has a role here to soften that blow in those high-risk but high-reward situations. My bill would take the 2007–2008 success stories with the Department of Energy, where phase one and phase two investments have been made. Investments in prototyping. You develop an idea, you bring an idea to the table, you convince DOE it's a good project, and you develop that prototype. And then you test it. And there are many success stories where they have built the prototype and it met the test. But then we don't do the next and final stage, the third stage, which is invest to deploy it to commercialization. My measure would take those 2007–2008 success stories and—standing as inspiration is SuperPower. Ten years into it, they're breaking their own records. They're getting into demonstrations that have now been proven successful. We need to continue to invest. Now is not the time to walk away from that system. We need to invest in it. Certainly, we have potential that is limitless, and we need to go forward, and it responds to those present-day and future needs of this Nation and does it in magnanimous measure that produces jobs in every element, every sector of the workforce.

So these are the great investments. Just like we're investing in community colleges—where we'll have before us in the near future measures to invest in community colleges. One of my local community colleges is investing in clean room science technology. So that as we develop these “clean” rooms with the nanoscience industry with chips that are manufactured, they can then be coupled with everything from agriculture as an industry to the pharmaceutical industry to health care to energy. There's great potential there. And these are partnerships that need to be fostered by the government. This is a role where the government can produce jobs, because they're removing some of the risk, and they're there because all society benefits from these opportunities. They're great bits of discovery.

And to SuperPower, I publicly want to thank them for 10 years of a success story. And I know they're going to go on to even greater things where we can apply this into high-efficiency situations. Think of it. As we begin to grow our renewables out there with solar arrays, with solar farms, with wind farms, we are then able to take direct current cable, where there's a hundred percent efficiency, no line loss. So as you're taking that generated energy, American-produced energy, you're now making certain there's no loss of that product in its delivery mode. And we're all prospering from that.

These are the opportunities we're talking about. They were put on the

back burner. MEP was told, You don't need to be funded any more. Manufacturing doesn't need our attention. Nothing could be further from the truth. We need to invest in these industries. And we can do it because we have the know-how. We invest through higher education, we invest through apprenticeships with our trade unions. We do all of this investing, but then we need to provide the hope. And the hope comes in a job—in a business that's produced that translates into jobs.

Let's do it. Let's do it in a progressive, visionary way that enables all of us to prosper. And I'm so impressed that the Democrats are putting together a strategic plan that ranges from health care reform to job creation to incentives and tax relief and credit line opening, dealing with that credit crunch and putting together the workforce training. These are the elements. These are the tools in the toolkit that will take us to a new era of job creation—some jobs not yet on the radar screen. That's the remarkable bit of visioning here, of public policy development and resources that are put together in the budget.

So I can't thank you enough for the small business passion that you bring to this House, Representative DAHLKEMPER. Your track record as a small business person is that inspiration for you to then influence us in putting together packages that allow us to provide that opportunity from coast-to-coast for this great country.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Well, Representative TONKO, I want to thank you because you have a lot of passion for small businesses and for job creation. You have been a great leader in our class and in this Congress. I'm excited about some of the new pieces of legislation I've heard about just here tonight—pieces of legislation that are coming out of the Democrats, coming out of particularly the freshman class of the Democrats, who I think have come to Washington with great ideas and with great solutions with how we can move forward.

You know, it was said that the Iroquois Indians, when they would make decisions, looked seven generations out. I'm not sure we're quite seven generations out, but we're looking out beyond next year, beyond the next election. We're looking out to the future and what is the best future for our country and how do we get there. We have to make sure we continue to make things in this country, as I know you and I both believe very strongly. We have to be innovators. We have to be the first in finding the new solutions to these issues that are huge but are so very important as we move our country forward.

Mr. TONKO. Representative DAHLKEMPER, I know that you've brought students to town. They've come from Pennsylvania from your district to visit. Today, I greeted students from Brown School in Schenectady, and as luck would have it, they came across

the Speaker. The Speaker had seen them in Statuary Hall, where all of these great figures remind us of leaders of this great country in our formative years, in our beginning years, where they spoke to a vision for the future. They are now those heroes that developed a strong sense of our past.

As she shared her thoughts with the students, she said to these eighth-graders, These are the giants that led us to today, but you're talking to Representatives here that are going to do the same thing. They're going to take us into the future. And the students understood. They understood that what we're doing here today is developing opportunity for them in a career path, in an education curve that will take them to higher ground and in job creation that will be there for them.

That is the challenge to each and every one of us as legislators—not to walk away from the crisis. A crisis is a terrible thing to waste. We have an opportunity here to take an economy that crumbled because of the lack of regulatory aspects, the lack of stewardship, the lack of watchdogs that could have kept it into working order. As that collapsed, this President offered a Recovery Act, and it stopped the bleeding. Now the awesome task is to build the economy we believe is strongest, that will be most responsive to the needs of this Nation. And when we look at it the investment in technology from health care, with all sorts of record-keeping done with technology, to education, wiring—hardwiring our communities with broadband and communications, creating opportunities, and energy generation and energy transmission, smart grids, smart metering—all of these opportunities that were denied are now front and center.

And so it's been a pleasure to join with you this evening to talk about not only growing out of this recession with soundness, but developing small business. Jobs, jobs, and hope for America's people. Thank you so much for your leadership. It's a great freshman class and I'm proud to be a part of it.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. It is a great freshman class. We have leaders in the great freshman class who will take us to that future and to the future that those students are looking forward to. I want to thank you all and all of my freshman colleagues who have joined me.

I do want to share just a few examples of some successful small businesses from my district, the Third District of Pennsylvania. Ibis Tek is a veteran-owned small business located in Saxonburg, specializing in products and accessories critical to the defense industry. Ibis Tek designs, manufactures, and tests important equipment such as transparent armor solutions for tactical and security vehicles; radio and video communication for unmanned ground vehicles; and emergency rescue devices for quick vehicle access and rescue. It's one of the many

companies in my district that are providing quality equipment to keep our troops safe. And for having been both in Iraq and Afghanistan over this past year, we certainly want to do everything we can to keep our troops safe. I'm just very proud that a company in my district is working on the latest innovation that's going to help do that.

Combined Systems is located in Jamestown. It's an engineering, manufacturing, and supply company of tactical munitions and crowd control devices globally that is given to law enforcement, corrections, and homeland security agencies. It is not only in defense that small businesses in western Pennsylvania are excelling. CCL Container in Hermitage is a leading manufacturer of recyclable aluminum products. They produce recyclable aerosol cans, aluminum bottles, barrier systems, and other specialty aluminum packaging. Since 1991, CCL Containers has been creating innovative solutions for product packaging that can be found in just about every home, from your beverages, cleaning products, hair products, and any number of goods that come in packages, using recycled aluminum, which is really great as we look to our future.

Just last December, a new small business came to Erie, Pennsylvania—Donjon Shipbuilding and Repair. Donjon Marine Company chose our region to expand their business because of the strong manufacturing base and expertise that I know you have in your region in New York State also. They're a welcome addition to Erie's business community and to a revitalization of using the lake that we have in front of us.

Finally, I'd like to highlight a small business in my district that's been serving our community since 1876, Hodge Foundry. You're going to be excited about that because they're actually working in the wind industry producing the castings for those very large poles that go up to the windmills. With 130 years of expertise, they produce some of the world's largest engineered iron castings right in my home district in Mercer County.

Mr. Speaker, it's small businesses like these that build the products and create jobs that change people's lives and move our economy forward. We must act swiftly here in Congress to enact legislation that will help our existing small businesses grow and hire new workers. We must create pathways for startups and entrepreneurs to turn their ideas into those successful businesses that I just mentioned and my colleagues have mentioned tonight. Small businesses are our investment in our communities and our entire Nation. I urge my colleagues to support the robust and strategic Democratic small business agenda that will help our businesses gain access to capital, create jobs, and develop the technologies and innovations that will move America forward.

It's very exciting to be here at this point in our history. I think our freshman class is a big part of the forward movement in this great agenda that we have. So I thank my colleagues, and I yield the rest of my time.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker for the recognition. Well, here we are, Tuesday night, Washington, D.C., 20 minutes until eight o'clock in the evening. What a day we have had here in the Capitol. Mr. Speaker, many of your constituents and my constituents probably tried to call our offices today to register how they felt about this health care bill. I know I have been encouraging people, whether they agree with me or not, whether they think I'm spot on or all wet, I have been encouraging people to call and let Congress know what you think about this massive government takeover of one-seventh of our Nation's economy. And people have responded. They have been calling.

But today they were met with either busy signals or interminable rings, because apparently the House switchboard was overwhelmed with the calls that were coming in. I will tell you I was concerned because I called my number for my office and got a busy signal, and yet walking around in the office, certainly not all of the phones were in use. So apparently this problem that Americans have encountered all afternoon has been one that has at its root and its cause in the antiquated House switchboard. I do hope the Speaker, I hope the Architect of the Capitol, and the Capitol business manager, will take that into account, because clearly, clearly we need to be able to hear from our constituents when we have such important legislation coming up to the floor.

So where are we as we work through this? Are we in the last throes? Are we still in for a long, hard slog? We have heard terms like the final push, the final stretch, the 5-yard line. President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, and Majority Leader REID have ignored calls by certainly every Republican, by many Democrats, many independent Americans, and just the American people in general, to really put the breaks on this current bill and to look at some of those things that people really want to see done, and do those.

We don't have a lot of credibility right now in the United States Congress. Recent polls I think today put it around 17 percent. No one trusts us with a 1,000-page bill that we passed out of committee last July 31. They darn sure didn't trust us with a 2,000-page bill that the Speaker's office came up with in October and that we

passed in this House in early November. They darn sure didn't trust the 2,700-page bill that passed in the Senate on Christmas Eve. And they sure don't trust what they see as a very difficult, tortured process that is now working its way through the House. And the reason they're having to resort to such legislative hijinks is because fundamentally this is a flawed bill. This is a bad bill. And it didn't have to be this way.

Look, most of us went home during August. We did our summer town halls, as we always do. We were all, I think, somewhat astonished at the outpouring of the American people just showing up on a hot Saturday morning in Texas to stand in a parking lot and listen to their Representative and question their Representative about what they saw happening up on Capitol Hill. To be sure, cap-and-trade was in the news those days; to be sure, the stimulus bill was in the news those days. But they were most concerned about this massive takeover of health care. Most of the questions dealt with that. And it wasn't like they didn't want to see anything done. But they didn't trust us to overhaul the entire system with one massive bill.

□ 1945

Sure, they want some help with pre-existing conditions. Yeah, they'd like to see people be able to buy across State lines and bring some cost down. Maybe some liability reform would be nice. Boy, wouldn't it be great if COBRA was a little more flexible. These were the things we heard. When we came back in September, I thought, okay, rewind, pause, slow this thing down, and let's look at it. Maybe let's work together. Maybe Republicans and Democrats can kind of come to some common ground because every Democrat was hearing the same stuff I was hearing. And I know that because I saw it on the evening news. I saw the YouTube clips. Their town halls in Florida, their town halls in Arkansas, their town halls in Michigan were exactly the same as the town halls that were going on in north Texas. There was no difference.

But instead in September, we come to a joint session of the House and the Senate. The President came and addressed us, and it was nothing of the sort that we're going to rework this process. We weren't going to check the weather. We're going to fly anyway, full speed ahead. Let's get this thing done. I think I heard it said again tonight in the discussion that just preceded us, A crisis is a terrible thing to waste; so let's take this economic crisis that we're in and force this health care bill on the American people. They don't know what's good for them, but we do; and this is what they're going to get.

It is a terrible bill. It's a flawed bill. It's a very tortured process. I'm going to do everything in my power to stop it, but it may become law. And if it

does, we need to know what's in it, and we need to know then what our next steps are to deal with those bad provisions that are contained within the bill.

I've been joined tonight on the floor by a gentleman that I've come to admire during my time in Congress. He has been a leader on this issue and on the committee in which we jointly serve, Energy and Commerce, and here on the House floor. JOHN, did you have some thoughts you wanted to share with us tonight?

Mr. SHADEGG. I do. I want to thank the gentleman for conducting this special hour, and I want to talk about a number of issues that you have already referenced. Number one, health care reform: I certainly think we need health care reform. I know you do. I know that we believe that while the current system provides very high-quality health care, it often denies people access. But I want to talk a little bit about what's in the bill as well. The gentleman talked about this massive takeover.

One of the things that stuns me more than anything else—and I know that you find this confusing—is that the proponents of this bill say that Republicans are defending the health insurance companies in America. Really? Really? This bill says that we're going to enact a mandate, an individual mandate compelling every American to buy health insurance from the health insurance companies that are selling them health insurance now. Huh? I'm sorry, I find that a little confusing.

There is an individual mandate that says if this bill passes and becomes law, as the Speaker would like to do this week, you—every single American, every American listening tonight—must go out and buy health insurance from the very health insurance companies that are ripping us off right now. Why? Why in God's name would we want to force Americans to buy health insurance from the same health insurance companies that are ripping us off right now?

This is a massive subsidy to those health insurance companies. It's a law. It will be the law of the land that says, you must, whether you want to or not, buy a government-approved health insurance plan from one of the companies selling health insurance right now. If they were doing a great job of selling health insurance right now, wouldn't the cost be affordable? Wouldn't they be holding down cost? Wouldn't they be giving us good service? Wouldn't they not be cheating us? I've got to tell you, I don't know any Republican who thinks that it's a great idea to compel people to buy health insurance from the same insurance companies that are selling us health insurance now. And yet that's what the individual mandate in this bill does.

I guess they like it because it has been applied in Massachusetts. In Massachusetts they passed a mandate like this. They said that every single person

in Massachusetts, by gosh, we're going to force you to buy a health insurance plan from some health insurance plan offered from a health insurance company in Massachusetts, and that will fix the problem. Did it fix the problem, Doc?

Mr. BURGESS. Not entirely. And what they found was, since you have to buy the insurance, the cost may have gone up a little bit.

Mr. SHADEGG. Oh, the cost went up. Wait, the cost went up? They have forced everybody in Massachusetts, like this bill would do, to buy a health insurance plan on the premise that the cost would go down. But in Massachusetts where they did it, the cost went up.

Mr. BURGESS. Up. Because you've got to buy it, or you get a fine.

Mr. SHADEGG. Ah, so it's Republicans who oppose this bill that are the pals of the health insurance industry? I don't think so. And you're telling me that in the one State where we've already tried this, a mandate that you must buy health insurance, costs did not go down, but costs went up. The cost of health insurance for the people in Massachusetts from before they enacted the mandate to after they enacted the mandate went up?

Mr. BURGESS. That's my understanding from the reports that have been done by Heritage and other groups. But interestingly, if Massachusetts wants to enact a mandate, they are a State. And if their residents say, Okay, we are happy with you, Governor. We are happy with you, State legislator or State senator, for enacting this mandate and they reelect them to office, that's all well and good. But here we're talking about the 50 States and various territories, a mandate applied across the board. This has never been done in this country before because there's a document called the Constitution that says we shouldn't be doing this.

Mr. SHADEGG. Wait, the gentleman's telling me that never before in Federal law have we ordered people to buy a particular product, that we don't do that in Federal law as a routine matter?

Mr. BURGESS. Just as a coincident fact for being born and living in the United States, no.

Mr. SHADEGG. No, we don't force people to do that. I guess we do say that if you want to drive in some places, you have to buy auto insurance to insure against damage to somebody else. Right?

Mr. BURGESS. Correct. And still, that is a State mandate.

Mr. SHADEGG. That's not a Federal mandate?

Mr. BURGESS. Correct. And there are some States who don't have the mandate.

Mr. SHADEGG. So this would be the first Federal mandate saying you must buy a product because the Federal Government tells you you must buy a product?

Mr. BURGESS. That's my understanding. It is such a good idea, as you correctly pointed out in your very graphic demonstration. The strong arm of enforcement here is the already existing Federal agency that collects our income taxes every year.

Mr. SHADEGG. You are referring to the sign I have next to me.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. SHADEGG. That's the IRS. The IRS is going to force you and me to buy health insurance from an approved health insurance company, federally approved health insurance. Maybe you can answer the question that is posited on this graphic: Why does the Democrats' bill subsidize health insurance companies? I don't quite get that. Why is it that Democrats are so adamant that we subsidize America's health insurance companies, those companies that are already ripping us off, overcharging us, undercompensating, don't pay our claims when we submit them, make the doctors turn in 46 copies of every form, then kick it back, then kick it back again? Can you tell me why the Democrats want to subsidize America's health insurance plans by ordering every American to buy one of those plans? Because I don't get it.

Mr. BURGESS. If the gentleman will recall in May and June of this year, six groups met down at the White House. It was a great photo-op. My AMA was there. The Hospital Association was there; PhRMA showed up; AdvaMed, the people who make medical devices; AHIP, America's Health Insurance Plans; and the Service Employees International Union all gathered at the White House. The President came out after this meeting and said that these groups have offered up \$2 trillion in savings to the American people in order to get this health care bill done. So I don't know. I wasn't there. I can't get information on these meetings.

Mr. SHADEGG. Wait, wait, wait. Are you telling me this is a deal? You're telling me these health insurance companies went into the White House and struck a deal, and the deal says, If you'll pass a bill forcing everyone in America to buy our product, we, the health insurance industry, will support your bill. That's a pretty good deal. Can I take, like, maybe some other company, a lumber company or an auto company, into the White House and say, Hey, if you'll strike a deal, we'll support some bill you want. You just have to force every American to buy our product. Right? Because, what the heck, let's strike a deal.

It seems to me the health insurance companies must have very good lobbyists closed tight, very closely to the Democrat Party. Because if I remember correctly, the health insurance industry wanted two things. They wanted a mandate. They wanted you and me to be forced to buy government-approved health insurance from these health insurance companies and to have the IRS enforce it. They wanted it. They got it. They did not want a so-called public

plan to compete with those health insurance companies. The health plans said, No, no, no. Competition, no, no, no. We health insurance plans don't want to have to compete. So we don't want to compete with a public plan. We don't want to have to compete across State lines. We don't want to have to compete for the business of individuals. We don't like that thing about competition.

As I understand it, those health insurance plans get out of this bill a mandate that you and I have to buy their plan, and there is no public plan to compete with them. That's good lobbying, I guess. If the Democrats will carry your water and say, We're going to enact a law that says that every American must buy health insurance from these health insurance plans and, oh, by the way, those health insurance plans don't have to face any competition.

They don't have to compete with a public plan. They don't have to compete across State lines. They don't have to even compete for your business and my business because right now, the Tax Code says that if we get it from our employer, it's tax free; but if you and I want to go out and buy it alone, if we made poor United or poor Aetna have to compete with each other for Dr. BURGESS' business or for JOHN SHADEGG's business, oh, they wouldn't like that. That might drive down costs. That might drive their profits down. That might drive down profits or the salary of their executives.

Well, they didn't want that. And in the Democrats' bill, you know what, they don't have to. There's no competition across State lines. There's no competition under the Tax Code letting you and I buy health insurance on the same tax-free basis that our bosses can buy at the companies. Boy, I'll tell you, those health insurance plans got good lobbyists in the White House. And that was a meeting, that was a deal that was struck down at the White House?

Mr. BURGESS. Well, we don't know because the White House refuses to provide us with any information, even though they've been asked nicely. They were asked more forcefully with the resolution of inquiry in our committee. Chairman WAXMAN and Ranking Member BARTON did send a correspondence down to the White House asking for that information to be supplied to our committee. To date, what we've gotten back is a series of press releases and reprints of pages off of Web sites, but no real information.

It would be fascinating to know if it's part of that \$2 trillion deal: okay, you're going to get a mandate. Maybe we'll leave out the public option. But, oh, by the way, we're going to trash you every day during this process, so get ready for the next year and a half. We will vilify your industry six ways to Sunday because they certainly have done a good job of doing that.

The gentleman points out an excellent point: if an individual is able to

buy a policy with the same breaks that a company gets, and that individual is able to keep that insurance over time, a longitudinal relationship with a health insurance company, what a novel concept. I've had the same car insurance since I was 18 years old. I can't tell you how many different health plans I've had because when I was in business for myself, I was always trying to find a better deal because that was one of the number one line-item expenses on my budget every year, providing insurance for my employees. So you were always looking to see if there wasn't a better deal somewhere.

And as a consequence, I frequently changed health insurances until I discovered what was then the medical savings account and now is the health savings account.

So kind of through the back door, I have now developed a longitudinal relationship with an insurance company. They send me emails, and they ask me to do certain things to keep myself healthy, and it works well between us. Why we didn't embrace that sort of model going into this, I just, frankly, don't understand.

Mr. SHADEGG. The gentleman raises one of the things that makes me so upset in this debate. And quite frankly, as you've pointed out, I've worked on health care reform since 1995. It seems to me morally indefensible, morally indefensible to say to the American people, If you work for a big, big, big employer—like you and I do, the Federal Government—or like we'll say, General Motors or Intel or Motorola or AT&T or any of those big employers, you work for a big employer, you're a lucky guy or a lucky gal because your health insurance is tax free. Your employer buys the health insurance and writes off the cost of buying that health insurance. Your employer then gives that health insurance coverage to you, and it's not income to you. So the tax on—we'll say a \$5,000 insurance policy—zero, zip, zero, nothing because you were lucky enough to go to work for a big employer.

□ 2000

But the law in America—and I think this is what is morally indefensible. And the law in America, even after this bill passes, says to the little guy, to the least among us, to those who are just barely getting by, to that person who works for, we'll say, a small garage or maybe, in my State of Arizona, a small lawn service company—

Mr. BURGESS. Or a doctor's office.

Mr. SHADEGG. Or maybe even a small doctor's office. If their employer doesn't give them employer-paid health care coverage, here's what we do the little guy. Here's what we do to the least among us. We say, Oh, you really ought to be insured, but we're going to smack you down. We're going to make you pay income tax first before you buy that health insurance; that is to say, we're going to punish you if you decide to spend your money on health insurance.

So the \$5,000 health insurance policy that this guy over here got from his employer that cost him zero in taxes, maybe it cost him or his employer \$5,000, that plan for the little guy who doesn't work from an employer that provides health care coverage, that plan costs \$5,000, we'll say, plus another third, or another, close to a third, we'll say another 15 or \$1,800. That plan costs the little guy \$6,800, because he has to go out and earn the \$5,000, then he has to go out and earn \$1,800 in income taxes on top of that and spend the total \$6,800—\$5,000 on insurance, \$1,800 on income tax—to get the same policy that the guy that worked for the big employer got for free.

How can we morally justify that in this Nation? How can we say that it is right to treat those people lucky enough to work for the Federal Government or a big employer, Intel, Motorola, you name it, UPS, you get essentially free health care paid for by your employer and not taxed to your employer or you, but this little guy who works, or woman who works for a small day care company or who works for a small sewing shop, she gets no health care for free, and she has to pay income tax on her income before she even gets to go buy a health insurance policy? How can that be justified, and why isn't that fixed in this bill?

Mr. BURGESS. Great point. And another point that is so often missed in this discussion, let's take the example of the National Football League. You've got the Arizona Cardinals; I've got the Dallas Cowboys. A player who is lucky enough to be traded from Arizona to Dallas—I'm thinking it's an upgrade—their health insurance goes with them. If they had a knee injury in Arizona, they're covered for that knee injury day one in Dallas on the new team.

But if the fan who wants to follow their favorite player moves from Arizona to Dallas, they cannot take that insurance policy with them, necessarily, across State lines. And, oh, by the way, that new policy you're buying in Texas, that knee injury may be excluded because, after all, it was a pre-existing condition. We will not apply the same degree of portability for the little guy that we do for the person who's covered under the large multi-State plans, the ERISA plans that the multi-State corporations can provide for their employees.

Make no mistake. I think that is wonderful that the large employers do that, and I don't think there is anyone among us who would want to see that system changed. But you are correct. We should provide the same breaks across the board.

Mr. SHADEGG. Going back to my board here, why don't Democrats want to force United to have to compete with Aetna for the business of that little guy so that he or she can buy health insurance, tax-free, like Intel can or Motorola can or the Federal Government can?

Why is it that America's politicians, about to pass this bill perhaps as early as this weekend, don't want to force those health insurance companies to compete? What's wrong with competition?

You mentioned auto insurance. I turn on the TV at night and I see TV commercials for every single auto insurance company I can imagine. I see one for GEICO. They've got their little gecko. I see Progressive. I see Allstate. I see State Farm. I see Farmers. I see all these insurance companies. They're all pounding me with their ads, and every ad says, Come buy your auto insurance from our company, and we will charge you less and give you better service.

And yet, there's not a single ad like that I've ever seen on TV where Aetna or United or any of those health insurance companies who, by the way, don't want competition from a public plan but do want an individual mandate compelling us to buy their product, I never see them advertise to me and say, Hey, John, come buy our health insurance policy, and we'll charge you less and give you better service. Could that be because they don't have to compete for our business? Because under the Tax Code that we're not fixing in this bill, you and I can't afford to buy health insurance directly from them, so they don't have to compete. They're protected from competition. They just want an individual mandate. Since they don't have to compete with each other, they complain that not enough people buy their policies. I think it's because their policies are too expensive. Since they don't have to compete, now they need a mandate to force us to buy their policies.

Why don't they have to compete like the auto insurance companies do?

Mr. BURGESS. Well, of course, the life insurance business, the premiums for life insurance plummeted with the introduction of the Internet with these companies that would advertise and then sell their policies on the Internet.

Mr. SHADEGG. So competition brought down the cost of that kind of insurance.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes. And the power of the Internet could apply to health insurance as well. But, as you know, there is some difficulty selling in the individual market across State lines, and therein is where the regulatory part of what we—the regulatory environment that we set here in Congress that we're not fixing in this bill, as you point out.

Mr. SHADEGG. Not fixing in this bill?

Mr. BURGESS. Not, not fixing in this bill, that that will continue to exist.

There are sites you can go to. You can go to Google and type in "health savings account" and get a variety of plans that will come up. And I encourage people who are looking for individual insurance, that is a reasonable thing to do. Yes, you have to pay with after-tax dollars. Some of those policies can be quite affordable if you're

willing to accept the fact that it will be a high deductible type of policy.

But, realistically, when you look at health care expenses—and I'm a physician. I've watched people spend their money in health care for years. Some expenses are so small that they're actually financed out of cash flow: aspirin and Band-Aids. Some expenses are predictable but larger: braces, having a baby, maybe arthroscopy on that knee injury. Those could be saved for or borrowed for if we allowed the correct flexibility within the health savings account, for example. And then there are the "Boy, I hope that never happens to me" events: the leukemia, the heart attack. Those are the ones where this catastrophic insurance really is a godsend when people have that.

But, again, we did nothing. We had—we both sit in the committee that deals with this. Did we have a hearing on how to provide more flexibility, more competition with the insurance market? No. It was, if you want everyone covered, it is an individual mandate. That really was the only offering. We never had a hearing to ask the question: Is there a way to cover people with preexisting conditions without an individual mandate? We never asked that question, so it's not surprising that we don't know the answer to that.

Mr. SHADEGG. You know, it stuns me that you just said that, under current law in America, if you work for an employer who gives you health care through your employment, it's tax free. There's no income tax paid on it by your employer, no tax paid on it by you when you receive it. But you can go on the Internet and you can buy health insurance on your own, but you've got to buy it with after-tax dollars, making it a third more expensive. Isn't it shocking?

Then, or more accurately, not to be cynical about it, isn't it pretty logical then that the health insurance companies don't compete? They don't care about our individual business because they know you and I can't afford to buy with after-tax dollars what we can get from our employer for free.

Tell me, I guess I just do not understand why we wouldn't want to fix the Tax Code so that every single American could buy their health insurance tax-free just like their employer, so they could hire it and fire it and hold it accountable.

The gentleman mentioned preexisting conditions and the Commerce Committee. I think the gentleman knows full well that, in 2006, we passed legislation through that Commerce Committee which dealt with the problem of preexisting conditions. We, as Republicans, in 2006, said, You know what? No one in America should go uninsured or go without care because they don't—because they have a preexisting condition. So we passed legislation encouraging all 50 States to create a State high-risk pool. Under a State high-risk pool, the State would be required to accept and insure anyone that had a preexisting condition.

I happen to have an older sister who is a breast cancer survivor. She's now lived 20 years beyond her breast cancer. She has a preexisting condition. If Arizona had taken advantage of that legislation, the State would have created a high-risk pool and she could have, if she was denied coverage, or if she was told her premium would cost too much, she could have applied to the State high-risk pool. She would have been entitled to be admitted to the State high-risk pool. She could not have been charged more than 110 percent or 120 percent of the cost of health insurance for a healthy person. But all of her care would have been paid for, and the extra cost of her care, as a member of that State high-risk pool, would have been shared; that is, would have been spread, the extra cost would have been spread amongst every single person in the State of Arizona who purchased health insurance, or would have been spread over the State tax base and subsidized by State revenues.

That legislation passed the Commerce Committee, passed the floor of this House by voice vote, passed the United States Senate by unanimous consent, and was signed into law, and is the law today. It didn't force the States to create high-risk pools, but 33 States have.

Now, we can improve upon that. I'd like to make them mandatory. But we've already dealt, or we can deal with preexisting conditions without a mandate, an individual mandate compelling people to buy health insurance from the same health insurance companies that are already doing a lousy job of offering us health insurance. And yet, when the President of the United States—this is very important. When the President of the United States held his health care summit—and I note you didn't get to go and I didn't get to go. But at the health care summit, the President misdescribed, and so did Secretary Sebelius, a high-risk pool. Both of them said, if you put all the sick people in and give them no help, of course their premiums are going to go up. But no State high-risk pool in America puts the sick people in and says to them, Now pay your own premiums.

What high-risk pools do is they put in the sick people; they guarantee them coverage; they cover their preexisting conditions, and then they spread the extra cost amongst all the taxpayers or all the people who buy health insurance in that State. And the reason people are willing to do that is because, but for the grace of God, you and I don't know that tomorrow we won't need to be in that high-risk pool. And I know you've dealt with high-risk pools.

Mr. BURGESS. That's correct. Thirty-four States do have the high-risk pools. NATHAN DEAL, the ranking member on our Health Subcommittee, and I tried to put some further refinements out there this year during the health care debate.

I don't like mandates. I know we had that discussion in committee today. I don't like mandates. So what if we allowed States either a high-risk pool or an option for reinsurance, provided some Federal subsidy to the State. They don't have to take it, but if they do take it, then whatever they decide they want to do, they need to then set up that high-risk pool or that reinsurance for that set of business that is otherwise likely to go without insurance coverage. Because we all know, folks our age, employer-sponsored insurance, we're in a recession. You lose your job, you have the heart attack, you didn't keep up with the COBRA payments, boom, you're in that category and now there's nothing you can do to extract yourself.

And the only option we were given was an individual mandate, or let the government take everything under their control.

Mr. SHADEGG. Federal legislation already passed in 2006 offered all 50 States some Federal money to help set up the State high-risk pool to care for those people with preexisting conditions and offered Federal money to subsidize or to underwrite the cost of those high-risk pools.

The reality is, every Republican plan, every Democrat plan deals with preexisting conditions because it's something that we, as a society, have already decided that we should do. Every single one of us knows that any moment we could be struck with a heart condition or diabetes or, like my oldest sister, breast cancer. We might be in the position and we oppose the, even, concept of someone being denied care because of a preexisting condition.

But I don't think the answer is a mandate. You said you don't like mandates. Okay. Some people may like mandates. I guess the issue is do they work. And of course the answer is, in Massachusetts, they worked to provide coverage, but the cost of care goes up.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, they may not be constitutional at our level. And the other thing to remember about a mandate, for a mandate to work, you have to know that it's in existence, and you have to know what the penalty is, and the penalty has to be pretty stiff.

You alluded to the IRS already. The IRS has a mandate on every one of us that we'll pay Federal income taxes. Every single one of us knows, we may not know exactly what bad thing happens, but we know it's bad, and most of us know we don't want it to happen to us.

So what is the compliance rate with the IRS in filing tax returns? Well, it's about 85 percent. What do we have as uninsured in this country right now? About 15 percent. How much more are we going to get coverage if we give up that much freedom by allowing us, us, Congress, to set a mandate as a condition for living in the United States of America? How much more coverage are we going to get?

I mean, the point is arguable, but just at first glance, it might not be that much.

□ 2015

Now, on the issue of the preexisting conditions bill, I know when NATHAN DEAL and I looked into this and the Congressional Budget Office scored and said what would it require in the additional Federal subsidy to make these things really work for people, the Congressional Budget Office came back with a score of \$20 billion over 10 years. Real money to be sure, but at the same time it is nowhere near the \$1 or \$2 trillion that is on the table today if the House takes up and passes this Senate bill that they passed on Christmas Eve.

I do have to make one point about the public option. The Senate bill does not have a public option per se, but there is language in the Senate bill that allows the Office of Personnel Management to oversee the exchanges and guarantee that there is one for-profit and one not-for-profit insurance company available in every exchange. If an exchange does not have an insurance product available, OPM will set up either a for-profit or a not-for-profit in that exchange.

Well, suddenly you are going down the road of a public option because what is the Office of Personnel Management? Well, it is a Federal agency. It is not used to doing that much work, because they oversee what goes on in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, but now they are going to be tasked with this vast new set of powers, and it's anyone's guess how that will actually work out.

Mr. SHADEGG. The gentleman started by commenting about the shutting down of the switchboards and whether or not individual citizens could get through to their Member of Congress today and express their feelings, and I would suggest right now maybe their intensely felt feelings in opposition to or in support of this bill. It seems to me that the American people, who are frustrated by that process, maybe ought to think about what organizations or groups they are a member of that might be able to get through.

I am a little concerned that individual Members of this body maybe aren't taking phone calls right now, maybe aren't reading the faxes or the emails they are getting right now. But everybody who sits on this floor listens to the big organizations in their district. They listen to the Chamber of Commerce in their district. They listen to the farm bureau in their district. They listen to the cattle growers in their district. They might listen to the homebuilders, who by the way under the Senate bill are singled out for particularly mean or unfair treatment, high taxes, in this bill. They might listen to the contractors association.

It seems to me that anybody who wants to make their voice heard and is a member of any kind of a professional association or a political association

that has contact with Members of Congress, if you can't get through to your Member of Congress, maybe you ought to call the local Chamber of Commerce and say, hey, I read where Congressman Smith or Congresswoman Jones is going to vote "yes" or "no". That is not what I want. You supported that, Congressman. Why don't you call him or call her and say, hey, I want a "yes" vote or I want a "no" vote. Because I will bet those Members of Congress will take calls from, for example, the local Chamber of Commerce or the local farm bureau or the local cattle growers association or some other organization in their congressional district that has spoken to them in the past, maybe supported them in the past. It seems to me that now is the time that you can use those organizations to reach out and talk about some of the issues in this bill.

You and I haven't talked so far tonight about some of the procedures. We haven't talked about the Slaughter solution, under which it appears the majority is going to push this bill through and try to say that they are really not voting for the Senate bill, or, for that matter, some of the special deals in the Senate bill. I find it interesting, yesterday apparently Speaker PELOSI said, quote, "Nobody wants to vote for the Senate bill." She actually held a meeting with the press and said, quote, "Nobody wants to vote for the Senate bill." I guess that is why they have come up with the Slaughter solution.

Let me ask you this question. Doesn't the Constitution say that for the Senate bill to pass the House, Members of the House have to actually vote for it or vote on it? Don't they have to pass that bill?

Mr. BURGESS. Certainly that is my understanding. And we both have to pass the same bill.

Mr. SHADEGG. The exact same bill. Mr. BURGESS. The exact same bill. We learned that in December of 2005. The Deficit Reduction Act had one word different between the House and Senate bills, and the whole thing was held up.

Mr. SHADEGG. Because of one word difference? One word difference. The Senate has already passed the Senate bill, the House has to pass that exact bill word for word. It can't have one word missing?

Mr. BURGESS. Actually, that is a House bill that the Senate passed. So we would simply have to concur with the Senate amendment, and that would be the identical bill. But in this case the Slaughter rule would say we don't even have to bring that bill to the floor, we just deem it—Deem me up, Scotty—we just deem it as passed and then go on to the reconciliation process to try to fix some of the problems with the bill. No guarantee that they will be fixed.

Mr. SHADEGG. I kind of think the American people are fairly bright. I think they see through this. If you are deeming a bill passed in a rule, aren't

you actually passing that bill and aren't you voting for that bill? And isn't this just a trick or a scheme to get around the requirement that Members actually vote for the Senate bill? I guess Ms. PELOSI says, this is a quote, it is right here, "Nobody wants to vote for the Senate bill." But when they vote for a rule that says it's deemed passed, aren't they voting for the Senate bill?

Mr. BURGESS. There is no question that they are. You are right, the American people can see through that. It's an elaborate charade. It will provide no protection.

Mr. SHADEGG. An elaborate charade. Trickery. If the American people think we are engaged in trickery, why not engage in trickery.

Mr. BURGESS. But, and I am sure the gentleman feels the same way, I would not want to stand in front of the 2,000 people on a hot August morning in a town hall in Denton, Texas, and say, you know what, I never voted for that bill. I voted for the rule that deemed the bill.

Mr. SHADEGG. There we go. So the reason you wouldn't want to stand on the floor and vote for that Senate bill is not just because of the policy in it, it is because that bill will contain the Cornhusker Kickback, right?

Mr. BURGESS. Correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. It will contain the Louisiana Purchase.

Mr. BURGESS. And Gator Aid.

Mr. SHADEGG. Right. It will contain Gator Aid. It apparently contains \$100 million for a local hospital in Connecticut that CHRIS DODD got in. It contains \$1.1 billion for Medicaid in Vermont and Massachusetts. I guess not Arizona or Texas. Our States didn't get that deal, right? No, just those States got the deals because DODD or SANDERS and KERRY got them in, right? It contains, I like this one, \$1 billion that Senator BOB MENENDEZ got in for New Jersey drug companies. Pretty good deal. I am not sure I would want to vote for that. My constituents might say, well, Congressman, why didn't you get a billion dollars for some companies in Arizona?

It contains \$1 billion for MENENDEZ. We are talking serious money when you go to JOHN KERRY and DEBBIE STABENOW. They got in \$5 billion for union health care plans in Massachusetts and Michigan. You already talked about the provision, the Florida Gator Aid, I guess, Medicare Advantage. I will tell you this is one that my constituents find offensive. Arizona has lots of people on Medicare Advantage. Apparently Senator BILL NELSON of Florida got in a provision saying Medicare Advantage won't be cut in Florida. I don't know how I go home and explain to my Arizona colleagues that it will be cut in Arizona. But I really don't know, since I am going to vote against this bill, how my Arizona colleagues go home—by the way, the press reported that the President wanted some of these special deals taken out.

But AP reported over the weekend that these Senators don't want those special deals taken out.

I think I agree with NANCY PELOSI. She said nobody wants to vote for the Senate bill because of all this junk, all of these secret special deals. So somehow they are going to not vote for it but they are still going to pass it? How do you do that under the Constitution? Maybe our colleague from Texas can tell us how you can pass something without voting on it.

I guess Newt said it today, there was a point in time when Members of Congress didn't read the bills that they passed. Now they are not going to vote on the bills that they pass. So what do we need to be here for?

Mr. BURGESS. I would just go back, too, to that instance with the Deficit Reduction Act, where a small difference in the House- and Senate-passed bills led to a court challenge, and we came back in January. We left on December 21st or whatever day it was when we passed that bill out of the House, it went over to the Senate, there was a problem, they couldn't fix it under unanimous consent because of an objection, and we had to repass the bill in January.

The reason I know this is because there was one of those doc fixes in that bill. And the doc fix did not go into effect December 31 and every doctor who saw Medicare patients across the country took a 6 percent ding in their Medicare reimbursement rates because we had not passed the bill by January 1.

Now, Dr. McClellan, Mark McClellan, to his credit, who at the time was Director of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, came back and said, you don't have to refile those claims, we will take care of them if Congress passes the bill within a month or two of coming back, which we did. So they went back and reimbursed. But a terribly, terribly complicated process. All of it was brought up because one or two words different in the bills, because the Constitution says we shall pass the same bill and then it goes down to the President for signature.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am trying to understand this. So if the Medicare Advantage participants in Arizona who are having their Medicare Advantage cut, and the Medicare Advantage participants in Florida who are not, under the Gator Aid that Senator BILL NELSON cut, that special deal, having their Medicare Advantage cut, if the House only deems the bill passed, can they sue and can they win? Or will the courts say, well, no, no, no, your Congressman may have said he didn't vote for the bill, he just deemed it passed, but trust me, we, the courts say he did vote for the bill. And so Arizona taxpayers on Medicare Advantage lose out, Florida taxpayers because of BILL NELSON and the special deal he cut currently in the Senate bill, which you say can't have a word changed when it comes here, they win out. Pretty good deal.

By the way, I look at some of these other deals, there is special funding for coal miners in Montana. There is just provision after provision. In North Dakota there are special provisions providing higher Medicare payments there. There are special provisions for Hawaii that apparently the two Hawaii Senators got in. There are special provisions for longshoremen in Oregon. You know, this thing looks to me like it is chockablock full of special deals for special Members, special Senators who say, well, you know, I want a special deal or I won't vote for it. No wonder Ms. PELOSI says, and I quote, "Nobody wants to vote for the Senate bill." But doesn't the Constitution say they either got to vote for it or it don't pass?

Mr. BURGESS. So we have two problems. The Constitution says we have to vote on the bill. We say the mandates may be extraconstitutional in their scope. And then the whole question of equal protection under the law. We have a constitutional scholar with us, so we turn to the gentleman from Texas, the judge from east Texas, for perhaps his rendition of this complicated process that faces us.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, clearly the majority leadership thinks that the American people are so stupid that if you have a rule that says, you know what, if you vote for the rule, then the bill automatically is deemed passed. I just don't know anybody in the American public that can't figure out when you voted for the rule, I don't care what you say, you voted to pass the bill.

As far as it passing constitutional muster, who knows anymore with this Court. But I do know, as the gentlemen, both of you have been talking about the deals and Medicare Advantage, and I have got the Senate bill here, this lovely thing, and the truth is the only people that ought to pass this bill are people that eat it. A little digestive humor there. If you eat it, then yes, you should pass it. But otherwise this bill should not be passed.

But if you look at page 904 of part one of two parts of the Senate health care bill, and you wonder, gee, I wonder why AARP came out a couple weeks ago and said, oh, yes, we like the proposal, we are all on board. Well, you look at the Senate bill, it says that nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to accept every bid submitted by a Medicare Advantage organization. And so also the Secretary may deny a bid submitted by a Medicare Advantage organization for a Medicare Advantage plan if it proposes significant increases. But the bottom line here is the Secretary doesn't have to accept a bid.

And what is the consequence of saying we are not going to allow any more Medicare Advantage bids, we are just going to cut that out? Do you know what retirement organization is in the business of selling a kind of supplemental insurance?

Mr. SHADEGG. Wait. Wait. Let me guess. Could it be AARP?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, it seems like maybe they do sell some supplemental medical insurance. So by golly—

Mr. SHADEGG. Maybe they got a better deal out of this.

Mr. GOHMERT. Maybe 904 is one of several reasons AARP said, you know what, this could be all right. We could get millions and millions of dollars in new insurance sales.

□ 2030

But did you see that the pharmaceutical industry says they like this bill, they are okay? And I read a headline today that the pharmaceutical industry was going to spend millions trying to get people to vote for it.

Mr. SHADEGG. So AARP likes it and PhRMA, which are big drug companies, like it. All of the big insurance companies like it because you're mandated to buy their product. And there is no public option competing with them, and they don't have to compete across State lines. Looks to me like all of the big guys really like this bill. They like the fact that they are getting lots out of it. What does Joe Six-Pack get?

Let me make a point. I put up a quote here from Speaker PELOSI. She said it on March 9. "But we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it, away from the fog of the controversy." Wow. Pretty stunning quote. Maybe those are things she doesn't want you to find out until after we pass it.

I know the gentleman has a point to make. I just want to point out. Talking about deals in the bill and special deals for health insurance companies. According to The Boston Globe of December 22, 2009, the Senate bill waives from any annual fee on health insurance companies certain additional fees, and this provision exempts two insurance companies, Blue Shield-Blue Cross of Nebraska and Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Michigan. That might be one more of those special deals put in there by a couple of powerful Senators, BEN NELSON of Nebraska and DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan, cut a little deal for a couple of Blue Cross-Blue Shield Nebraska and Michigan companies—maybe that is what Mrs. PELOSI meant when she said, But we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

If you look at page 1,957, along the same lines of what kind of deals that are in this bill, this has to do with health savings accounts. We know that there are millions and millions of dollars in health savings accounts that only can be used for health care. Well, I know I have an HSA, and if I can get an over-the-counter drug, a generic drug, that is what I buy.

Well, good deal for the pharmaceutical industry here beginning at page 1,957, because it says that such terms shall include an amount paid for medicine or drug only if such medicine or drug is a prescribed drug.

So you may want—like in my case, I have hay fever. I've had since it since I

was a little kid. I go and get a generic for like \$2.50. And now if I want to spend my HSA on it, I can't go spend \$2.50. I've got to go pay megabucks to the pharmaceutical companies in order to get a prescription drug.

Wow, maybe that is part of the deal that made them think, You know what? You know Joe Six-Pack, as my friend from Arizona says, may not get anything out of it, but by golly, we're going to make a lot of money on this bill. Let's throw our support behind it, and the President will love us for it, too.

Mr. BURGESS. One interesting point. You have these groups that went down to the White House in May and June—and I'm not going to criticize them for going down and advocating on behalf of their industries, on behalf of their groups. But what is so onerous about this is the President has proclaimed this Sunshine Week. Transparency is going to be the watchword of his administration. Remember? We heard it over and over again. Everything will be up on C-SPAN, everybody will be able to see it—except for these deals that were struck down in the White House in May and June. And now they come back and say, Well, there really wasn't anything written down. Two trillion dollars in savings and you didn't write a word of it down?

Now, in Texas, as the gentleman knows, we trust each other. A handshake is as good as a signature a lot of times. But when it's \$2 trillion, you're probably going to need a little more than a handshake even in Texas, because are people going to perform as they said they were going to perform?

When Senator MCCAIN wanted to push an amendment that dealt with reimportation in the markup of the Senate bill, in the debate of the Senate bill at Christmastime—I don't agree with reimportation. I think it's unsafe. I think it's unwise. But Senator MCCAIN was prevented from offering that amendment because, to quote somebody at the time, That wasn't part of the deal that we had.

Well, wait a minute. If there is a deal that someone knows about, is it written down somewhere? Could we please see what else is in that deal? We're the legislative body. If there are deals struck at the White House—and it is Sunshine Week—if there are deals struck at the White House, let us see what those deals are.

I'm not criticizing the groups that went down there and advocated on behalf of those groups. That is fine. They should have done that. But we, as the legislative body, should have been privy to any of that information as we tried to craft the legislation that would have to either enact or confirm or deal with those deals.

Mr. SHADEGG. Well, it seems to me that while we do not know what the quid pro quo was for any given deal, we know a couple of things: We know the insurance companies went in first and foremost and said, We want an indi-

vidual mandate. We want the government to compel every American to buy federally approved, Federal Government approved health insurance, and we want the IRS to enforce that mandate. You must buy Federal Government approved health insurance. That is what the insurance companies wanted going into the deal. Funny, that is what they got. They got an agreement that there would be an individual mandate.

So if this becomes law, every single American will be required to buy a government-approved health insurance plan. And if they don't, the IRS will tax them. Huh.

We also know, although the gentleman points out, there is no individual mandate in the Senate bill—there are some things that are pretty close to it—the insurance companies didn't want competition. They certainly didn't want across-the-State-line competition, they didn't want the State tax code to say you and I could buy it tax-free so they would have to compete with each other like the auto insurance companies. It sounds to me like we can kind of decipher some of the outlines of the deal that occurred.

Mr. BURGESS. And I can be as critical of the insurance companies as anyone else, but they take the path of least resistance. Their capital is not necessarily any more courageous than anyone else's. The easiest way to get to what they want is an individual mandate.

But I suspect if we set up pretaxed expenses, buying across State lines, if we develop that market for them, I'll bet they'd find a way to compete, I'd bet they'd find a way to work in that market and win in that market.

Mr. SHADEGG. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point.

The truth is America's health insurance companies are playing under the rules we set, and the rules we set say they really don't have to compete for my individual business, for JOHN SHADEGG as an individual customer, or yours, or our colleague from Texas because the Tax Code says we cannot buy health insurance like our employers can. We can't buy it tax-free, but our employers can.

I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. I think the reason that the auto insurance industry competes every day, day-in and day-out, pounding us on TV saying, you buy our plan from GEICO or Progressive or Allstate or Farmers, we will give you better service for a lower cost; and the health insurance companies don't compete day-in and day-out saying, you buy our health insurance plan from United or from Aetna or from Blue Cross-Blue Shield, and we will give you a better price at a lower cost.

The reason they don't compete like that is because the government sets the rules. And the rules say that they sell pretty much exclusively to big companies, and we say to the poor working stiff who can't get employer-

based health care, too bad, pal. You kind of don't count in the system. The insurance companies don't really want their business, they don't market to you, and if you buy their product, you have to buy it with after-tax dollars. Tragically not fixed in this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Let me point out just one thing.

We hear over and over again Republicans have no solutions for health care. HealthCaucus.org is a Web site that deals only with health care policy. On that Web site, Dr. BURGESS's prescription for health care reform, the seven or nine things that I heard consistently in my town halls this summer are up there. People can download that and look at that themselves.

Suffice it to say that we really have been frozen out of this process from the beginning. They were not interested in our input last year because they had a supermajority in the House of Representatives. You can't pass a bill with 40 extra votes? What's the matter with you?

Well, now, the entire argument, the entire argument is within the Democratic Caucus. They don't have the votes on their side because it is a badly flawed product and a badly flawed process that they are trying to push through on the American people.

People do need to understand this bill has nothing to do with health care any longer. This bill has, as has been pointed out tonight, if we wanted to fix these things, we would have fixed them. This bill is about higher political power for the party in charge, and they want to obligate the American citizenry to re-up their contract every 2 years in order to not lose the benefits that they are ostensibly going to get with the bill.

The bill is a bad deal, Mr. Speaker. I would submit that the American people need to continue to weigh in on this. All is not lost. Time is not up. There is time to make a difference.

I'll yield to the gentleman for a final thought.

Mr. GOHMERT. I just appreciate all the work you've done. There are several bills that have been proposed by Republicans.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentlemen for their time this evening.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate the opportunity to come up and continue the discussion on health care from a little different perspective than my friends on the other side have been giving the American people.

I want to talk about the need for health care reform in the United States of America and what we need to do here in the Congress to get it done.

We had a nice discussion yesterday in Cleveland with the President of the

United States. I've been one who has said that if we're going to do this, we need to do it. We have got other issues that we're dealing with simultaneously now with jobs, passing a second jobs bill. My community back in northeast Ohio has benefited a great deal from the original stimulus package that has passed here. But we need to continue the work of getting the American people back to work. And in the short term, that means job packages, that means financial reform so we should bring some integrity back.

But in the next week or so, we have to pass this health care bill. And I know there's been a lot of controversy surrounding this bill. There's been an extended discussion over the course of the last year or so on this issue. We have talked about all of the issues, and now it's time for us to have a vote in the House of Representatives—hopefully here in the next week—and pass this bill so that we can move the country forward and start addressing the other issues with regulatory reform on Wall Street, trying to bring some discipline back to the financial system. It's also allowing us to go back and continue to focus on the jobs issue.

But under this bill, you talk about long-term economic growth as we try to be competitive in the United States, globally competitive competing with China, competing with India. The American businessperson now has an anchor strapped around their neck in the form of health care costs. And if we think that we can continue to grow our economy, hire American workers, make the proper capital investments, make the investments in technology, if our businesses are asked to compete while dealing with the health care system that over the last 5 years has increased over 120 percent for small business people, we are asking our small business owners to go into the shark-infested waters of the insurance market so that they can cover their citizens, their workers, and then ask to compete on the global playing field.

□ 2045

They can't do it. The small business people are screaming for health care reform. Now, you want to get into an ideological battle, but what we are trying to deal with on this side of the aisle are practical, pragmatic solutions to the problems that are facing us, looking at the facts, looking at the issues that are facing our country, and addressing those issues in a bipartisan way.

I know many on the other side have said, well, we have been locked out of the debate. I want to know one time when the last President spent 7 hours sitting around a table with people from both parties to discuss any issue, let alone health care. President Bush never sat down, Madam Speaker, for 7 hours. President Bush never came to our caucus and had the kind of discussion and question and answer that President Obama had a few months ago

when he went to the Republican Caucus. And I think this shows why he is the President of the United States, by dealing directly with their questions. He was able to do that and has included the Republicans and tried to include the Republicans every single step of the way.

But the Republicans are getting their marching orders from their pollsters and their consultants. And one of the memos was leaked early last year, as many of us remember, that said to the Republican Caucus, do not let Obama pass health care, because he will succeed, and the Democrats will succeed, and you will be in the minority for decades. That is what their consultants told them.

So right from the get-go, our friends on the other side of the aisle had no interest in being part of the solution here because their pollsters were telling them that they had to defeat this bill before we even knew what the bill was. Our friends on the other side were calling it socialism and government-run medicine before we even had a bill to actually look at and discuss.

So they got the media machine all cranked up, got everybody all fired up before we even had something to talk about. So fast forward through a long discussion, long talks where we included both sides of the aisle to try to solve these problems, and now we have a solution. We have a compromise that President Obama has submitted for us to vote on. And we continue to get some numbers, hopefully here tonight, on the exact scoring, but we are close, we know give or take a few bucks where we are at, and we know that this bill will cover 30 million more Americans and this bill has a number of issues in it that are going to benefit the American people.

Let's look at some of the issues, some of the pieces of this legislation that will be implemented within the year. Small business tax credits, the President's proposal will allow small businesses tax credits up to 35 percent. We close the doughnut hole in Medicare. Now our seniors have \$2,000, \$3,000, where it's covered through Medicare part D, and then they fall into a doughnut hole for months and months and months until part D picks back up again several thousand dollars later. Our Medicare recipients have to come out of pocket. We close that hole up. We close that doughnut hole up.

We end the rescissions so that insurance companies can't kick you off the rolls once you get sick. We eliminate insurance companies from being able to deny people coverage because they have a preexisting condition. That is in this bill. We have a provision in this bill that says no child can be denied health insurance because they may have a preexisting condition. We eliminate the lifetime caps of policies so that when someone in your family gets sick and they need coverage, that all of a sudden the insurance company can't say, well, you have spent your allotted amount of money, you're on your own.

It is our moral responsibility to prevent millions of Americans from getting hurt, from getting hurt under the current health care system. And there is no denying it: free preventative care under Medicare under this provision, free Medicare under private plans in this piece that we are putting together here.

Also for people who are 55 and older, between 55 and 64, this creates a temporary reinsurance program until we get the exchange up and running to help offset the cost of expensive health claims for employers that provide health care benefits for those people between 55 and 64 years old. That's what's in this bill. Those are the things that just come online this year. And the improvements will continue.

This is a good bill. Is this a perfect bill? Of course it's not. But we have people on the left saying it doesn't go far enough and voting against the bill, and we have people on the right saying it's socialized medicine. But if it were socialized medicine, people on the left would be voting for it.

This is a pragmatic bill, a pragmatic solution to the health care crisis in the United States of America. And our friends on the other side of the aisle and our friends in the insurance industry say that we should start all over, we should start from scratch, get out a blank sheet of paper. Well, maybe the insurance industry should start from scratch and go back to 1992 and '93 and revoke all of their increases that they have given to the American insurance consumer over the last 20 years or so, rescind all of those increases. You start over. Let the insurance industry start over, and then maybe we can consider starting over.

But people in my district over the last few months, few days, few weeks, were getting 20, 30, 40, 50 percent increases. Small businesses are almost going bankrupt because of the increase of 50 percent to their health care costs. This fixes it. This allows small businesses to go into the exchange, to get tax credits so that they can provide insurance for their employees.

Now, some of those things that I read, and I know a lot of our friends on the other side say that people don't want this, here is the poll that says American people don't want this. And I'm the first to recognize and acknowledge that we probably haven't done a very good job of telling the American people what's in this bill. And that was the essence of Speaker PELOSI's comments about when you pass the bill you'll find out what's in it, meaning that when we pass the bill, the rhetoric and the fiction that has surrounded this bill for the longest time will fall away, and there will be a document that we can all point at, and the American people between now and November will be able to look at what has passed.

We know what's in this bill. We've been debating this for a month. I like how our friends on the other side in one breath say we're trying to jam it

through, and then you look, and the American people are tired of the debates. But you can't have it both ways.

Now all of those things that I mentioned, here is a Kaiser poll: tax credits for small business, 73 percent of the American people more likely to support the bill. Tax credits are in the bill. In fact, these are all in the bill. Insurance exchanges, 67 percent of the American people support the insurance exchanges. The ability to keep what you have, 66 percent of the American people are more likely to support this bill if you can keep what you have. You can keep what you have in this bill. Ban preexisting condition denials, 63 percent are more likely to support this provision of banning preexisting conditions denials. Expanding Medicaid, which is what we do, 62 percent; dependent coverage through 26 which means if you're 26 or under, you can stay on your parents' insurance. How many people support it? Sixty percent. Closing the Medicare doughnut holes, as I mentioned earlier, 60 percent; subsidy assistance to individuals, 67 percent more likely to support the bill.

So we have not done a good job of messaging this bill, but I will tell you what is going to happen. We are going to have an election in November, and I'm looking forward to it. I'm looking forward to the debate because in the debate our friends on the other side are going to want to repeal this piece of legislation. They are going to run their campaign in November about repealing health care reform.

So they are going to have to go out and run commercials saying, those small businesses tax credits are up to 35 percent, we want to repeal them. The ban on preexisting conditions, we want to repeal that. The ban that says no kid, no child can be denied because they have a preexisting condition, they're going to run a campaign in the fall saying, we want to repeal that. The lifetime caps that we're going to eliminate so you can get coverage no matter how sick you get, our friends on the other side are going to run an election saying, we want to repeal that.

The subsidies that people are going to get so that they can afford health insurance, our friends on the other side are going to run a campaign in November saying, we want to repeal that. Helping people 55 to 64 get reinsured, they're going to want to repeal that. Closing the doughnut hole in Medicare, I can't wait to go to the senior centers in my district when this has already been implemented and we've started to close that doughnut hole and the seniors have seen some of the progress, and we go in there and we say, our opponents want to repeal that provision where we closed up that doughnut hole.

Let's have this debate. Let's have this discussion. Let's do it. That's what this is all about. We implement our agenda, then we go out and defend it. And we know what happened. The 8 years, more like almost two decades, 14 years, 12 years actually, that our

friends on the other side were in charge, and then with President Bush controlling the House, the Senate, the White House, our Republican friends on the other side had an opportunity to implement their political philosophy.

House, Senate, White House, we got their supply side economics, we got their foreign policy, we got their health care policy, we got their energy policy and we got their education policy. And look what happened. We got their Wall Street policy, and look what happened. We had a collapse of the financial markets, we had college tuition balloon through the roof, we had energy costs balloon throughout the roof, we had health care costs balloon through the roof, the collapse of our economic system, a prescription drug bill that was not paid for with a doughnut hole you could drive a truck through, and a foreign policy that forced us to a war, an elective war in Iraq.

All of these things were implemented when our friends were in charge. And we had elections on those. And now we are going to pass health care, and we are going to pass our agenda and you look and you see what happened with this stimulus package, the economy is starting to open up, trying to straighten up Wall Street. But we know we can't move forward until we get health care costs under control. We know small businesses are never really going to be able to grow at the pace and the capacity that they need to grow to with this health care anchor hanging around their neck.

Now, I believe that, and many of us on this side of the aisle believe, the government has a moral mission, a mission, a moral mission to protect its citizens. Whether it be terrorists or criminals on the street, there is a moral mission to the government to protect people. And that doesn't stop at the borders. That doesn't just stop with the issues of crime. That responsibility hits every aspect of our society. And if we have an industry that is hurting people, then we have a responsibility to step in and push back that industry and say enough is enough. You're hurting people.

In our country, the government has a moral mission to stop that from happening. That is what this debate is all about, yes, the role and the responsibility of government. And the government is not allowed to just completely step aside while industry abuses happen and happen and happen.

□ 2100

And that is what this debate is about. That is what this bill of rights, health care bill of rights is all about.

And our friends on the other side say, We are for this stuff. They say, We are for it. You pull it out; we are for it.

Well, that is interesting, because we had some votes over the last day or so in committee. This is the House Budget Committee that is starting to pass the legislation that is going to be needed.

Here we go. Protecting Medicare for America's seniors and closing the prescription drug doughnut hole, 15 Republicans voted against it.

Closing the doughnut hole, voted against it. If you talk to them, Well, we are for closing the doughnut hole. We have got to close the doughnut hole.

Protecting Americans from insurance caps, as I just talked about, and banning annual and lifetime limits on health care coverage, 15 Republicans voted "no," we don't want to do that.

Holding health insurance companies accountable, 15 Republicans voting "no."

Bringing down the cost of health insurance for everyone and providing tax credits to small businesses, all of them voted "no." Every Republican on the Budget Committee voted "no" for giving tax credits to small business people.

I mean, this is the equivalent of our friends on the other side who all voted against the stimulus package, and then they go back to their districts when money is coming in and they say, This bridge, this road, this money is going to create jobs in our district.

But you voted "no" against the stimulus package. Don't tell anybody. That is the kind of thing that has been going on in Washington. That is called the old Potomac two-step. The old Potomac two-step.

So we have these provisions in this bill that, when you pull them out and you explain them to the American people, have anywhere from 57 to 73 percent. This is what the American people have been crying out for. And when this bill passes, we are going to have a lot to campaign on and run on.

But our friends on the other side like to talk a little bit about polarizing issues. One of the most recent polarizing issues that they have tried to pull out is the issue of abortion and trying to say that this is going to publicly fund abortions.

Well, we have a letter here from, I believe, 25 or so of the top pro-life citizens in our country: Joel Hunter, senior pastor of Northland Church. I believe he was head of Focus on the Family at one point; Jim Wallis from Sojourners Magazine; a lot of evangelical and Catholics; the former associate general secretary of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, all saying that this Senate health bill upholds abortion funding restrictions. The Catholic Health Association, 600 Catholic hospitals.

I went to Catholic school for 12 years. I know where the Catholic church and the Catholic hospitals stand on the issue of public funding for abortions, and believe me, believe me, I had a lot of nuns and a lot of priests and a lot of brothers going to Our Lady of Mount Carmel, in Warren, John F. Kennedy High School, and I will tell you that those nuns and those administrators who run Catholic hospitals, 600 of

them, would not support this legislation if they believed that there was public funding for abortion.

And I think the head of the Catholic hospitals said that—we are all pro-life, but they believe that the language in the Senate bill, some of the language that we kicked around here early on in the House version, will sufficiently prevent public funds from being used for abortions.

That is 600 Catholic hospitals saying that. That is not me saying that. That is not the Democrats say that. This is Joel Hunter and a variety of others who are professors of Christian formation and disciplines, discipleship, Pentecostal, theological seminary, Leadership Institute, Loyola University, University of Dayton, Duquesne. These are some of the leaders. Jim Wallis from Sojourners; Ron Sider, Evangelicals for Social Action; Catholics and Alliance for the Common Good, on and on and on.

But our friends on the other side, because I know, I was getting calls in my office today, getting people all hopped up on the abortion issue. Let's look at the facts. Let's look at what is in this bill, and we are going to have that debate. And just like the discussions in August about death panels and we are going to kill people's grandparents and all that nonsense that we heard in August, where did that go? It dissipated. It just disappeared because it wasn't the truth. And so it just faded away. And all of these arguments that our friends on the other side are making now are just going to fade away because they do not reflect the facts. What reflects the facts are the things that we are trying to deal with here.

Now, look at some of the stuff that we are trying to address. Between 2009 and 2010, monthly prices in the doughnut hole increased by 5 percent or more for half of the top 10 brand-name drugs. So increased by 5 percent or more for monthly prices for these drugs that most of our seniors get.

Now, from 2006, full negotiated prices for top brand-name drugs between 2006 and 2010, and I will just use some of the percentages here: Plavix, for example, 25 percent. Lexapro went up 25 percent; ADVAIR, 32 percent. Unbelievable increases in prescription drugs. And we are asking our seniors to continue to pay these increases that happen when they fall into the doughnut hole.

So, Madam Speaker, we have got a moral responsibility because so many people are being hurt in our country today, and I stand here this week as we stand on the brink of passing a significant piece of legislation that is not perfect, and I don't think anybody says it is. We are all human here in this Chamber and in the Senate. The President and his team, we are all human. We are going to make mistakes. It is not going to be perfect. But what we are doing is moving forward in a significant way.

One of the huge issues we have in this country is that we have millions

and millions of Americans who don't have health care, so what they do is they show up at the emergency room and have no money. They are not on Medicaid. They are not on Medicare. They don't have private insurance. They are not a veteran, so they go into the emergency room when they get sick. This is what happens.

Not only is that inhumane and not only, I would think, do we have some kind of moral duty as elected officials in the United States to say, you know, that is just—I have got a problem with that. That is just not right. What do we do? We have got to do something.

So this bill is an attempt for us to do that, to step in and help people, empower them to be able to afford insurance, and create a system where they are able to afford their health insurance and go into this exchange and be able to afford insurance. Because some people say, Well, I don't want to pay for those people. I got mine and I got my health insurance and I am cool. I have got a job and it is all right.

But you are already paying for them, because what happens is four or five uninsured go into the hospital, go into the emergency room, costs a lot of money but don't have any way to pay for it, and then you walk in behind them and you have your insurance card. Guess who is paying for their treatment that they didn't pay anything for? You are and the next guy who walks in with an insurance card and the next person. These costs all get shifted and so you see these huge increases.

So we have a system where we don't prevent anything. We wait until people get deathly sick, go into the emergency room, stay there for a week instead of getting a \$20 prescription that would have saved us all a boatload of money.

This is not a discussion about whether the government is going to run the health care industry or the insurance companies are going to run the health care industry. This is about doctors running the health care industry. This is about making sure doctors don't have to call up the insurance companies and haggle with them over what is covered and what is not covered.

It is 2010 in America. We are the wealthiest country on the planet, and we have the most dysfunctional health care system going. Yes, we have got tremendous high-end care. But if you were setting up a system, you wouldn't certainly say to 30 million people in your country, Just wait until you get absolutely deathly sick, then show up at the emergency room and we will take care of you then. That is not how you would set it up.

And our friends on the other side love to have this discussion about we are losing your freedom. You are losing your freedom. You are not losing your freedom. How free are you when you are sick and you can't get anybody to take care of you? How free are you then? How free are you when you want

to leave your job and go get another job, but you can't because you have a preexisting condition or your spouse has a preexisting condition or your child has a preexisting condition and you are stuck? That is not our idea of freedom.

How free are you if you want to go start a business and create wealth and jobs in the United States, but you can't because you have a preexisting condition? How free are you as a small business person? If you are just the average small business person, you had a 126 percent increase over the last 5 or 6 years. Now, how free are you to run your business the way you see fit, to make the investments that you want to make into capital, into technology, into worker training, into wages for your workers, more into the pension plan for workers, hire more workers? How free are you?

And these folks that can't afford health care and they get a lot sicker than they would normally have gotten, what kind of quality of life is that? Life, liberty, pursuit of happiness. These things mean something. And when you talk about what the Founding Fathers meant when they said life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, they meant that government has the responsibility, a moral responsibility to protect people's lives, liberty, and their ability to pursue happiness. And when we have a system in place now where an industry is limiting that freedom, reducing that quality of life, the government has an obligation to protect them so that they can be free, and that is what we are doing with this piece of legislation.

I mean, look at what is happening here, the issues that we are addressing. Think about this. This is what is in the bill. This big bogeyman that you hear about on Fox News that is going to end western civilization as we know it if this thing passes has a 35 percent tax credit for small businesses. It says that children cannot be denied health insurance because the kid has a preexisting condition. It is going to say that the lifetime caps that people have on their insurance will be eliminated so, no matter what, kids will get covered. It will extend coverage so that young people can stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26 years old. If they are getting out of college and want to go on to get an advanced degree or they hit a rough patch with the job market or they are trying to figure things out, you are not going to be booted. And how many parents aren't going to have to worry about that anymore? Free preventative care under private plans, free preventative care under Medicare so we can prevent a lot of these problems from happening.

If you are 55 to 64, there will be a reinsurance opportunity for employers who are employing people 55 to 64 to make sure that those people have coverage. The doughnut hole will be closed over time so that senior citizens can afford their prescription drugs. And

when you look at all these things, from time and time and time again, these are very popular among the American people.

Tax credits for small businesses, 73 percent more likely to support. Insurance exchanges, 67 percent. Keep what you have, 66 percent. Ban preexisting conditions, 63 percent. Medicaid expansion, 62 percent. Dependent coverage through 26, 60 percent. Close the Medicare doughnut hole, 60 percent. Subsidy to individuals, 57 percent. And all of these things, as we start to vote on them, our friends on the other side say, Well, we are for those.

So in the last day or so the House Budget Committee was working on this legislation and they had some opportunity to vote on these issues, and so I just want to share with Members of the House how our friends on the other side on that committee voted.

Protecting Medicare, closing the prescription drug doughnut hole, 15 Republicans voted against that.

Protecting Americans from insurance caps, banning annual and lifetime limits on health care coverage, 15 Republicans voted against that.

□ 2115

Holding health insurance companies accountable; 15 Republicans voted against that. Bringing down the cost of health insurance for everyone and providing a tax credit to small businesses; 15 Republicans voted against that.

These are the basic provisions of our health care reform bill that between 57 and 73 percent of the American people support. This is not Medicare for all. This is not single-payer. There's no public option in this bill. Many of us on this side don't like some of that—the fact that those aren't in there. But this is a significant step forward, some basic reforms, and when we have 15 members of the Budget Committee on the Republican side consistently vote against tax credits for small business to get health care, you know they're doing it for one reason: They're doing it for politics. Madam Speaker, this is all about politics. Go back to the memo that someone left somewhere in some room that the press got a hold of that told the Republicans, Do not let Barack Obama pass health care reform. Do not let them. Do not let the Democrats get this big victory because you will be in the minority for another decade or two.

And so right out of the gate they had no interest, Madam Speaker. Our friends on the other side had no interest in cooperating. No interest in adding to the debate. They were against this bill before there was even a bill written. They were calling it socialism before there was one item printed on this piece of paper here telling us what was on this bill.

That's not what the American people want. The American people want us to sit down, work together—no one is going to get everything they want—and pass something and move it for-

ward that's going to help the American people, that's going to allow us to meet our moral obligation to protect the American people, to protect those kids who are being denied because of a preexisting condition, to protect those seniors who fall into the doughnut hole, to protect those families who get denied because of a preexisting condition, to protect those families who hit a lifetime cap and get thrown out on their own.

This is what this is about—to help empower thousands of small businesses who've got the anchor around their neck because they get 20, 30, 40 percent increases in health care. That's what this bill is about. It's about protecting our citizens, it's about empowering our citizens, it's about making our citizens freer than they are today when they're trapped in this ungodly health insurance system that hurts many of them. We can't stand by and stick our finger up in the air and see which way the wind is blowing and allow millions of people to go get hurt, and then 30, 40, 50 years from now go sit on the rocking chair. Our children are going to ask us what we did when we were in Congress. What did you do to move the country forward? And we're going to say what? We failed. We didn't muster up the courage to make the tough votes. We didn't have the ability to look through the clouds and the smoke and the mirrors, look past the bogeymen that have been created on this bill.

I love it. I love how these arguments have just fallen apart, from death panels, now abortion. They're saying everything is publicly funded abortion here. And 600 Catholic hospitals are endorsing the bill. Now how do you say that this is public funding for abortion when 600 Catholic hospitals have endorsed this piece of legislation? So our friends on the other side need to go to all these 600 hospitals and all the sisters that are there, intimately involved in the health care of their patients, and all of the Catholic administrators of all of these hospitals and say, You're pro-abortion. Good luck having that argument. It's a phony argument that's being created for politics, just like the death panels were, just like the illegal immigrants were going to be covered under this bill. All of those issues have been demagogued in this House and across this country to try to scare legislators and the American people. And the dust is going to settle, and we're going to be able to look back on this vote.

I look forward, Madam Speaker—I will tell you this—I look forward to the debate in the fall discussing with the American people exactly what is in this bill. I look forward to talking to my Chamber of Commerce, my friends in small business, that they're going to get a 35 percent tax credit, and they're going to be able to go into this exchange and negotiate with a bunch of other small business people, thousands, to have some bargaining power to reduce their health insurance costs. I

look forward to going into a debate saying, You know what was in this health care bill? We made sure that no insurance company could deny any child because they have a preexisting condition. No insurance company could deny a citizen of this country because they have a preexisting condition. That our seniors are going to get more prescription drug coverage. That our citizens, when they hit a catastrophic health event in their life, that there won't be any lifetime caps or limits to how much they can be covered. Madam Speaker, that is what this health care debate is about.

No matter how many times our friends on the other side try to say they want to work with us, they have been given the opportunity to sit down and work. And they say they're for a lot of these things but, again, already in committee, peeling out the votes, closing the prescription drug hole in the Budget Committee, 15 Republicans voted “no,” we don't want to close the doughnut hole. Protecting Americans from insurance caps, banning annual and lifetime limits on health care coverage. This is the vote. That's all the vote was on. Fifteen Republicans from the Budget Committee voted “no,” we don't want to protect Americans from the caps and ban annual lifetime limits. Holding health insurance companies accountable, 15 Republicans said, No, we don't want to hold them accountable. Bringing down the cost of insurance, providing a tax credit to small businesses, 15 Republicans voted “no” for a tax credit for small business because their consultants and pollsters told them they couldn't let this bill pass.

So out of 15 Republicans on each one of these votes, a majority of the Republicans on all of these votes, out of the 15, voted “no,” we don't want to do it. In some instances, it was close to all of the 15.

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity here to make history. But that's not why we're doing it. We're doing it because this government, from its inception, this government from its inception has had a moral mission; a moral mission to protect and empower its citizens. And when an industry and their unsavory business practices are hurting the American people, we have a moral obligation to intervene. And we have a moral obligation to empower by making sure that our citizens are free to go in and have expanded choice, that they are free from an insurance company saying, You're off the rolls now because you got sick. You're empowered because you can be healthy and get access to care and you can experience the liberty that this country has provided—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That's what this bill is about, and I look forward to having an opportunity to continue to advocate for it.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It is my privilege and I'm honored to be recognized to speak here on the floor and to address you tonight. Having listened to my friend and colleague from Ohio talk about the high moral calling that there is for them to pass socialized medicine, I'll just tell you, Madam Speaker, it's hard for me to reconcile those things. It's hard for me to think of a country—a beautiful country with a deep, rich, free tradition that would give up its freedom and its liberty and its sense of responsibility for the sake of the government providing something that 85 percent of people are providing for themselves.

The statements that were made by the gentleman from Ohio about what is not freedom—it's not freedom to be able to start your business and have to worry about paying health care premiums or it's not freedom to see those premiums go up by a large percentage every year. That whole spiel, Madam Speaker. And I think it misses the point entirely. I think the freedoms that I'm hearing the gentleman from Ohio talk about are the types of definitions for freedom that I hear talked about by those that live in places like Canada or the United Kingdom or France or one of those countries that has socialized medicine; one of those countries that says freedom is having free health care provide by somebody else paying for it as a taxpayer. It's not the measure of freedom. It's not the measure of liberty. The measure of freedom and liberty is entirely different. You can't ever measure freedom by what is free, because freedom is never free. And it is a huge dichotomy in this Congress that people on this side of the aisle that want to subvert the definition of freedom. And so I will just say freedom is not about what is free.

Let's talk about liberty. Liberty is to be able to make the decisions for yourself, but be bridled by morality. That's the difference between liberty and freedom.

Other people in the world talk about freedom as in what's free from government, as if that's a measure of liberty. But when you talk about what's free from government, first of all, it's never free. Somebody has to pay the taxes, whether it's the people who are earning and paying taxes now or whether it's the children or grandchildren that they would foist this debt upon with this socialized medicine bill.

Madam Speaker, we could stand here tonight and we could talk about nuance after nuance of what's in this bill and what isn't. The truth is, the gentleman from Ohio doesn't know. And I suspect that nobody in the entire Democrat caucus knows. I'm confident nobody on the Republican side knows what's in this supposed negotiated

change. A night or more ago, there was a bill that was brought to the Budget Committee. It's a shell bill. It doesn't have in it the changes that they're trying to get established here. It's a shell bill. It's designed to start the clock ticking so that when they get the arms twisted and the Speaker uses all the leverage at her disposal and we can hear the bones breaking across Capitol Hill from arms twisted up behind people's back, some of them carrot—some of them stick.

When all of that is done, they want to have this machinery in place so that the Speaker, who sits up in her office making these deals behind closed doors, will have a bill come down here to the floor that nobody has seen, at least so far, and a bill that will be a reconciliation package that is unprecedented in its tactic, in its procedure, to propose changes to a bill that is the Senate version of the bill.

And this is the unbelievable part, Madam Speaker—the very idea that we have before us this week, and at least threatened to come forward if the votes can be put together this week, a socialized medicine bill, a bill that could not today pass the United States Senate. A Senate version of the bill wouldn't pass in the Senate. Everybody in America knows that. That's why the results of the election in Massachusetts made so much difference. The people in Massachusetts, arguably the least likely in this modern era to save liberty for Americans, voted SCOTT BROWN in as their Senator. He said that he would oppose this Senate version of the health care bill.

□ 2130

The bill that passed on Christmas Eve can't pass today on the eve of St. Patrick's Day. Not out of the Senate it can't, Madam Speaker. And so we are in this odd, perverse situation where perhaps for the first time in the history of America—and if this happens, certainly with the largest magnitude of impact, a bill that can't pass the Senate in its current condition—that being the configuration of the Senate as reset by the people in Massachusetts and the American people—a bill that can't pass the Senate comes to the House that's to be passed here on the floor of the House under the Slaughter rule, which deems it has been passed but doesn't require people to vote on it.

And so we have a bill that could very well go to the President of the United States where he is salivating to sign it, a bill that couldn't pass the Senate, a bill that couldn't pass the House, but nevertheless could become the law of the land. That is the breathtaking anomaly of what we're facing here, and it's in a bill that cannot be brought here to the floor of the House because, even though Speaker PELOSI can let 37 Democrats off right now, according to the most recent news reports, those 37 happen to represent “noes” or hard “noes,” and another 55 are undecided.

And if the Speaker's to pull the votes together, she's got to run the table on

the 55 undecided and hold all of the “noes” together. Every undecided would have to decide that they're going to be in favor of socialized medicine for this to work. And the brokered deal would be that they would bring the Senate version of this to the floor under a rule that would be self-enacting, a rule that would be configured right up here on the third floor in that little old Rules Committee that I call the hole in the wall, where the hole in the wall gang usurps the liberty of this deliberative body and usurps the franchise of the Members of Congress and send the bill down here under a limited amount of debate time.

Probably it would be a closed rule, so there would be no amendments to the rule; and the rule would be self-enacting which would automatically deem that the bill that has passed the Senate in the past that couldn't pass the Senate today is deemed to be passed by the House of Representatives, even though the Members on this floor don't have the will to vote for it so that it would go to the President of the United States, whom I said is salivating to sign it.

He would sign it, and we would have the law of the land, a bill that swallows up one-sixth of the economy of the United States and nationalizes the management of the health care of every American, over 300 million of us, into law enacted, without being able to pass the United States Senate, without being able to be supported and passed for the purposes of becoming law in the House of Representatives.

And then behind that, the Speaker is asking people who have gone through a crucible to get here—and I will say, Madam Speaker, I respect the intelligence of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I think it would be hard to believe that there are people in this Congress that would be so stupid to believe that they could be promised that if they just vote for the Senate version of the bill with all of its warts, moles and scars and all of the smelly things that are part of it, the Cornhusker Kickback, the Louisiana Purchase, the Florida Gator Aid, the national health clinics to the tune of \$11 billion, and about six or seven other special packages and components that are in the Senate version of the bill, none of them passing the smell test.

But asking this House to vote for a rule that automatically enacts it so they don't have to vote for the bill on the promise that there would be a reconciliation package that would be passed here in this House that would go over to the Senate that would be designed to fix the flaws in the Senate bill, strip out the Cornhusker Kickback, strip out the Louisiana Purchase, strip out the Florida Gator Aid, and strip out the \$11 billion worth of public health clinics that have been leveraged by BERNIE SANDERS from Vermont and those other six or seven egregious bargains that have been made and convince the Democrats, 216 of them, to

vote for a bill that will be followed by a reconciliation package that may or may not have the votes to pass the House of Representatives.

Then it would go straight down that Hall to the Senate where the Senate would have to take the changes to the bill that they passed that are dictated by the House and expect that that's going to happen, even though procedural obstructions fall in the way in a breathtaking fashion down to the point where just the parliamentary rules would threaten to strip out half or two-thirds of a reconciliation bill, including the Stupak language which isn't going to go in here anyway.

So you end up with the Senate bill becoming law and a futile effort on the part of the House to follow through on a promise to the Members of the House that don't want to vote for this thing that have been leveraged to vote.

And what is the configuration of the Democratic Caucus, Madam Speaker? What are they thinking, and what would they like to get accomplished here? Here is where they sit. They sit in three places, just to analyze the political configuration here because this isn't policy anymore. This is politics. Politics are this: hard-core left-wing liberals, every member of the Progressive Caucus which is linked to the socialists in America, they're all for this bill. It nationalizes health care in America. It may not do it in the first stroke of the pen, but it gets us there. And to be fair, there may be one or two of those that will decide that it's not lefty enough for them. But that core of the progressives, the socialists, the lefties, they're going to vote for this bill because they believe in it. It's a deep conviction on their part.

The second component will be those Democrats that believe that they will take the risk, and they think that they can somehow figure out how to get re-elected to come back to this Congress even though the American people, by the hundreds of thousands, have risen up in every way they know how to say "no" to this socialized medicine.

And then the next component of this, these are the people that are members of the Democratic Caucus that have decided that they need to vote for this bill for the sake of preserving, let me say, their President's mojo, their President's political capital. To keep the caucus together on the Senate side, they would say, I'm going to have to sacrifice myself because this cause of keeping Speaker PELOSI in power and Barack Obama's mojo flowing is more important than their seat in Congress or the voices of their constituents, which, by the way, reflects to be almost one and the same thing.

So there's the configuration. Left-wing liberal progressives that will vote for the bill because it moves us towards socialized medicine—it either is or gets us there eventually; those who will take the chance and decide that they think that they can hold their seat even though they'll vote for something

that the American people have rejected, spit out, Madam Speaker, three to one for the most part in this country; and then those that believe that they can somehow either hang onto their seat or they're willing to pay the sacrifice. Three categories. That is what's going on.

And then of course you have the Democrats that will vote "no." If 37 of them vote "no," this bill can pass by a vote of 216-215. If 38 of them vote "no," then the bill fails. And I will predict that if it's clear that the bill is going to fail even by one vote, we will see, Madam Speaker, a lineup of Democrat Members of Congress come down here to the well and pull their red cards out of the box that will be sitting on this table and take their felt-tip pen, and they will write in there and change their "yes" to a "no." This bill will either pass by one or two votes or it will fail by 40 because they don't want their names on this turkey, but they're determined politically to move this through.

Here's what we also have, Madam Speaker, and that is that this all started back a year and a half or more ago, 2 years ago during the Democratic Presidential Caucus, and it started in Iowa. I mean, it is my home territory. I see it. I know it. Hillary Clinton had pushed the National Health Care Act as the first lady in the early nineties, in the beginning years of Bill Clinton's Presidency. Yes, she closed the doors, and she had backroom deals. She did write a bill, though; and it was socialized medicine. It was single-payer. The Federal Government takes it over and creates all these new agencies. It was a scary and threatening thing to what it would have done to our freedom and our liberty. And then the American people rejected that, spit it out, so to speak.

And back here we are 15 years later with Hillary Clinton's opponent in the Democratic primaries pushing a socialized medicine program that is in some respects different from that that Hillary pushed. The American people see this, and they rejected it, and they spit it out.

What has been created is a toxic stew. They went in and put this all together. President Obama wanted a, and still wants, a single-payer plan. Single-payer is a complete government-run takeover of health care, socialized medicine. He has said so. It's a matter of record. So they went together to try to figure out how to write a bill, and from the beginning, it was this—and I will do the metaphors, Madam Speaker.

They went back into old HillaryCare, and they took that old soup bone that was laying on the shelf in HillaryCare in 1993 and '94. It had been sitting there for 15 years. All the meat stuck to the bone was tainted. They took HillaryCare off the shelf, and they put it in the pot, just add some water. They said, Hey, look what we have. Voila, we have socialized medicine—oh,

no excuse me—single-payer plan. The American people don't want it to be called socialized medicine.

And people looked at that skeptically and said, That's not enough. So they began adding more and more pieces, more and more bells and whistles, other ways to try to blur the taste of that tainted meat that was in that stew. By the time this has been churned through from June of last year, July, August—especially August—and September, October, November, it passed the House. By then, the American people knew that there was a toxic stew that had been cooked up and created by the Democrats in this Congress. A toxic stew.

It started with old HillaryCare, dropped that old tainted soup bone into it, and then they began to add other vegetables and bells and whistles to try to blur the taste and mask it. It's still tainted. And the American people have said over and over again in every way that they know how that they don't want a potful of this toxic stew. They don't want a bowlful. They don't want a ladleful. They don't want a spoonful of this toxic stew. American people do not want any measure of the toxic stew of socialized medicine, but that's what we have because the elitists and the arrogance of the liberals have decided that they understand what's right for posterity, and they can manage, Madam Speaker, the people in the country who apparently can't manage themselves.

But what I see is 85 percent of the American people who are insured and 85 percent of the people who are happy with their insurance. These are the people who want to be able to make their own choices for themselves, and that's what will be rejected. There is a whole list of things that go out the window if this socialized medicine bill is passed.

We are not the kind of people who should be moving towards greater and greater dependency classes. We're the kind of people that believe in freedom in the true sense of the word. We believe in liberty. We have our constitutional principles, our constitutional values, and this bill does not reflect them. I believe if it does become law, there will be court challenges to the constitutionality of it. We will see, as a matter of certainty, health insurance premiums will go up for Americans. The younger you are, the more you will see the premiums go up.

There will be a large amount of non-participation, people who decide they're going to pay the fine, whether it's \$800 or \$2,000, because it's cheaper than the higher premiums that will be driven by this bill. And then when they get sick, they'll be going to buy health insurance to cover them after they're sick.

And one of the first things that's enacted if this legislation should become the law of the land is—they'll call it the fix. It's the change in preexisting conditions. So it would prohibit an insurance company from considering

that an applicant had preexisting health problem conditions, which means that if you prohibit that consideration of preexisting conditions, who would buy insurance until they got sick? Wouldn't you just wait until your house was on fire and buy your property and casualty insurance? Wouldn't you just wait until the hail was pounding the roof to shreds and buy your property and casualty so you can make your claim?

That's what will happen with health care. That's about the only thing that happens right away, Madam Speaker, except for the increases in fees, the increases in taxes, the increases in revenue that comes with this in this bill that is, according to JUDD GREGG, a \$2.5 trillion bill. And that was when they scored it almost a year ago. Now you can add another \$400 billion to \$500 billion to the cost because the revenue has been shut down, and they would sign a lot of people up over the next 4 years before the benefits kick in. That, Madam Speaker, is what we're dealing with here today.

And it's one of the reasons that my good friend Judge GOHMERT from Texas has come to the floor. He carries a tremendous amount of knowledge and a tremendous amount of passion about freedom and liberty. He's been here defending this night after night after night here on the floor, in press conferences, at rallies everywhere in America. LOUIE GOHMERT has a place to go. He's stepped up to defend our freedom and our liberty, like all Americans should be doing and like the Americans who filled this Capital City up today. I would be happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, my friend LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Iowa so much, and I appreciate the wonderful points you are making. I was here just out off the Chamber for the whole discussion by our colleagues across the aisle.

□ 2145

I always appreciate when people across the aisle attempt to speak for me and what I support and what I would like to have happen and what I will and do vote for and vote against.

But the great thing about debate is that the other side can be presented. Of course, you know, there was the occasion a year and a half ago where the Speaker cut off the microphones and that was prevented, but we stood here on the floor and spoke anyway. That's the great thing about America.

But I would like to correct some things. Although I know my friend had the best of intentions of speaking on Republicans' behalf, but when he said Republicans have no interest in being part of the solution, I have to differ on that. And I appreciate my Democratic friend saying we don't wish to be part of the solution, but that's simply not true. And, in fact, I know Republicans that begged and pleaded to be allowed to have input into this bill, but it's

hard to have input into a bill that's negotiated secretly.

You get the union and AARP and you don't tell any Republicans when they're going to be meeting, when they're going to do their secret deals. You get the pharmaceutical industry and, yes, you get insurance companies to be part of secret negotiations. And I can promise you this, every industry, every individual who has come out and said I think this is a great bill on behalf of some industry, they got a deal cut for them in this bill.

Now, this is the Senate bill here. I've had our House bill until this week. That's what I'd been working from. But it looks like they're serious about cramming the Senate bill down our throats, and they use real thin paper and print on both sides so that it's this small.

But some other things that need to be corrected my friend across the aisle said during his time. Our friends on the other side of the aisle support the insurance industry wanting to start all over. Well, my friend's not completely informed, because there are those in the insurance industry that say, You know what? This bill, the Senate bill, it's okay with us. It would be all right. And if you're in the insurance industry and you have the Federal Government mandating that everybody has to buy a policy, then, you know, your eyes get big and you start thinking, Wow, think of all those sales.

Of course, they don't look far enough into the future and realize that that plan and they, themselves, as insurance companies, won't last very long. They'll go the way of private insurances or insurance companies offering flood insurance. When the Federal Government got involved, it's hard for a private company to compete with the Federal Government that goes in the red and stays in the red, as the Federal flood insurance policies have done.

He also commented that the Democrats are holding health insurance accountable. And that's nice to hear being said, but if they were holding health insurance companies accountable, you would not find one insurance company that's going to be okay with this, and there are those out there.

My friend also commented that 67 percent of Americans support an insurance exchange. Well, in the House bill, which we've talked about it, there's the Federal insurance exchange program, and that's what will take over as they finish killing off the private insurance companies.

And as my friend and I both agree, we don't want insurance companies between us and our doctor. We don't want the government between us and our doctor, and the proposals we've made get them out from between us. They get insurance companies back in the position of insuring and out of the business of managing. Why would we want the Federal Government to come in and manage our health care decisions when we don't even want private

insurance companies managing our health care insurance?

And I do appreciate my friend's honesty and candor when I understood him to say, first, that we have a moral mission. We have a moral mission, he said, to protect even the terrorists and the criminals on the street, and that that moral mission apparently does not stop at our border. Well, this is just a difference in philosophy.

And I have a few other points that I want to make here, but I feel like my friend from Iowa will want to comment on this because we've had such lengthy discussions about this issue. And it is just a difference in philosophy that we have friends across the aisle that believe we have a moral mission to protect terrorists, to protect criminals on the street, and that that moral mission does not stop at the border.

And see, my belief, and I believe it's shared by my friend from Iowa, is that when I took an oath to the Constitution, when I was in the United States Army, as a prosecutor, as a judge, as a Chief justice, and as a Member of Congress, there was nothing in my oath that I take so seriously about supporting and defending those on the other side of our borders or supporting and defending all enemies, foreign and domestic, that want to kill me. It was not that I want to support and protect and defend all terrorists and enemies, foreign and domestic. No, it was I'm going to help protect America from all enemies, foreign and domestic, protect from those enemies, not go across the border and take my morality to other countries and be the policeman of the world. And, in fact, I think we do make a mistake when we begin to be country building, nation building, government building in other nations. Our job is to protect this country. And when there are terrorists in this country, our job is to take them out, eliminate the terrorists so that they are no longer a threat.

Now, what normally happens when people declare war on another group or country and you capture some of those people, in a civilized society like ours, you hold them until such time as their friends, their colleagues, their comrades decide and announce we're no longer at war. Then you can release all of those, except for the ones you believe or have reason to believe, probable cause to believe committed war crimes. Then you go ahead and try them.

But it's just a difference in philosophy. And I'd love to hear my friend from Iowa if he has a comment on that obligation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I appreciate the gentleman from Texas, as I listened to the gentleman from Ohio talk and to spread this philosophy that somehow, first, there are principles that they've been trying to drag back and establish rights that don't exist for a long time. This goes back to, probably, Woodrow Wilson or earlier, but FDR comes to mind. And if one should go out to

FDR's Memorial here in this city, you'll see the memorial that displays the four freedoms. Back in those years, Franklin Delano Roosevelt made a speech about the four freedoms, and Norman Rockwell painted the cover of a magazine on that that showed the four freedoms, one at a time. The first freedom was, freedom—let's see—freedom of speech. The second one was freedom of religion. The third one was freedom from want, and the fourth one was freedom from fear.

Now, I go back and look at that, and I don't think I was very old when I first realized about that speech of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the four freedoms speech—the freedom of speech, religion, want, and fear—and I knew even then, as a young man, that there is no freedom from want and there is no freedom from fear, that these are things that can be resolved. These aren't rights that come from God.

Our liberty comes from God. It says so in the Declaration. We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal. And we're endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

And by the way, the pursuit of happiness, in the left-wing version, means anything hedonistic you might want to do that makes you happy or gives you pleasure for the moment. But pursuit of happiness our Founding Fathers understood was rooted in the Greek word *eudaemonia*, which means that pursuit of truth, both the physical and the mental versions of truth.

So we have these liberties that come from God that are clearly delineated in the Declaration of Independence and the foundation for our laws in the Constitution, and no one in America has a God-given right for freedom from fear or freedom from want. Those are manufactured rights that jerk this country off on to the left towards the socialist side of this.

And as I listen to this debate on health care, it comes back to a position that's continually made, that people have not only a right to health care, but they have a right to their own individual health insurance policy that they own.

And the folks on this side of the aisle, the Democrat side of the aisle, have continually conflated two terms. Well, many more, but the two that I'm talking about are the terms "health care" and "health insurance." Over the last year and a half or 2 years, the subject has been conflated to the point where, when people say "health care," often they mean health insurance. And if you say "health insurance," you generally mean health insurance. But if you say "health care," you might mean health insurance or health care.

And many Democrats on that side of the aisle, and I don't know that that's the case with the gentleman from Ohio, have made the statement that everybody in America has a right to health

care and that they have a right to their own health insurance policy.

And I'll make this point, that everybody in America has access to health care, albeit in some cases it's the emergency room. Everybody has access to health care. We don't let people die in the streets. You'd never see that happen in the United States. We take care of people.

We don't have a collapsed system, as the gentleman from Ohio would have us believe. We have the best health care delivery system in the world. We have the best health insurance system in the world. Both of them can use improvements, and we should do that. But we should not throw the baby out with the bathwater. We shouldn't give up on the great things that we have that give so much quality and so great a life expectancy in this country for the sake of moving towards the socialization or the nationalization of a policy that diminishes us as a people.

And so, going through those four freedoms, freedom of speech, freedom of religion—which I agree with, those are God-given rights—freedom from want and freedom from fear, takes me back to a hearing we had in the Ag Committee at the beginning of the markup for the last farm bill that we did. And there, Janet Murguia, the president of La Raza—La Raza, I would point out, Madam Speaker, is the organization that is called—the "La Raza" is Spanish for "the race."

Now, if we had a, let's say, Caucasian organization that was exclusive to that, that had called themselves "The Race," they would be called the racists. But meanwhile, we accept La Raza as the people that are doing the negotiating for our food stamps.

And Janet Murguia testified that one of the obesity problems we have in the United States comes because people, they know where their next meal is going to be—they couldn't find somebody that was suffering from malnutrition—but she said that they may have anxiety about where their next meal is going to come from.

I think I am going to pick this up in a little moment and yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I appreciate that very much. I would like to follow up on that with something that our friend across the aisle said before us tonight. He said that when this bill passes, we'll have a lot to run on, and I agree. And I think they'll need to be running a great deal after this bill were to pass because the vast majority of Americans don't want it to pass. That's very clear.

So you ask yourself, Why would the majority of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the President try to cram a bill down the throat of a majority of Americans that don't want the bill when it could hurt them politically?

Well, there is so much government in this bill that they know if this bill passes, then the government intrusion,

whether you want to call it socialism or progressivism, it's the government taking over such a massive part of our lives, basically taking over our lives.

But I would want to point out page 100 of the Senate bill. You know, why were the unions so happy to jump on this? You know, unions are beginning to look at their health insurance policies as—some of them are—as a massive debt, and they'd like to get rid of it, and we know that they'd be unable to do this under the bill. But people will be glad to know, people who are in unions who are retired and have union health insurance, they'll be glad to know that they won't lose their union-negotiated health care, at least not until the date on which the last of the collective bargaining agreements relating to the coverage terminates.

□ 2200

So people will be able to keep, if you're in a union, or, Madam Speaker, people are in a union or they have retired and they have union health care, they can be assured they do not lose their health care—at least not until the date on which the last of the collective bargaining agreements relating to the coverage terminates. And then, of course, once a new union contract has to be negotiated, all bets are off.

So that should provide some comfort if there is a year or two left on a collective bargaining agreement, then they can be comforted. They have got that insurance if they like it, and they can keep it until the collective bargaining agreement terminates.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas from picking up there from where I was forced to leave off.

To take this up then, Madam Speaker, the situation of asking Janet Murguia, the president of La Raza, to testify as to why we needed to increase food stamps by 46 percent before the Ag Committee. And not being able to find people that are suffering from malnutrition and not being able to find people that aren't having their meals today, they testified that there were people that were having anxiety because they don't know where all of their future meals were going to come from. And because they had had uncertainty, they tended to overeat, and if they ate out of anxiety—not having full comfort that there would always be plenty of food for them there, they might attend a feast or gorge themselves in those times—she argued if we would just give everybody 46 percent more food stamps, people wouldn't have this food anxiety, and they would eat less, and we would solve this human obesity problem, at least improve it, by providing food stamps for people.

Now, here I am sitting in the United States Congress, highest level in the land or the world, for that matter, and I'm listening to a witness begin to tell us why we should expand food stamps. And her argument is if we give people

more food, they won't be as fat. People are fat because they eat out of anxiety, and if we make sure there was a mountain of food in front of them, they wouldn't eat out of anxiety anymore and apparently they would lose weight and they would be slender.

Now, my response to that takes me back to the statement that I made earlier about the manufactured rights that came out of the presentation of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Freedom of speech and religion, that's fine. The other two of the four, freedom from want and freedom from fear, now those are breathtaking principles to lay out in the 1930s. But if you listen to Janet Murguia's testimony, her argument is that people have a right to have freedom from fear of want. And that fear of want causes people to overeat so they get obese, and if we can solve that problem and give them their freedom from fear of want, then they won't eat as much, they'll be thinner, and they will be healthier.

This is a bizarre, upside-down, topsy-turvy world that we live in, Madam Speaker. And when we think about what freedom is and what liberty is, Americans that understand it have an entirely different understanding of what liberty is than people in Canada, Great Britain, and around the world. Their argument is that whatever is free expands freedom.

So if you have a lot of food stamps and rent subsidies and heat subsidies, you'd have a lot of freedom. I suppose you would because you wouldn't need to go to work. You would have the freedom to go do whatever you want to do, sit around and be a couch potato, or go off to play golf or go fishing every day.

But that's not what we're talking about. Not the freedom to be irresponsible or not to take responsibility for yourself. We're talking the liberties that come with this Constitution, that liberties that allow us the right to speak freely, to worship as we please, to peaceably assemble, and redress our grievances, the right to keep and bear arms, the right to keep property. However, the Kelo decision altered the Constitution itself. The right to face your accuser, to have a jury trial. The list goes on and on. Free from cruel and unusual punishment. Those are liberties that we have. They are delineated in Constitution. These are laws that come down from God. But He didn't ever promise us that we wouldn't have fear from want because there is something intrinsic in human nature that says that we have got to get out there and strive and struggle.

But this Democrat health care bill is about expanding the dependency class in America. If they can expand the dependency class—they're the representatives of the dependency class; we're the representatives of the liberty class. We're the people that want to work, that want to expand families. We want to provide for and encourage more personal responsibility. We want to see that spark of vitality come out of

every human being. And we want that to join together. And we know that our job is to find ways that we can to lay the groundwork and help nurture so that the average annual productivity of the American goes up. If it does, so does our quality of life—at least in terms relative to the rest of the world it does. We have got to have a moral foundation to do that. And it requires individual responsibility, not growing the dependency class.

If you take people and they're on a safety net already, a safety net that has been cranked up to where we are a welfare State today—some 71 different welfare programs—and this safety net that was designed to keep people from falling through and freezing to death or starving to death now has been cranked up to the point where the safety net has become a hammock, Madam Speaker, and the more comfortable that former safety net, now a hammock, is, the less incentive there is for people to take care of themselves. They lose their incentive.

And so they lose their will to try, they lose their will to be creative. They lose their ingenuity. And they don't think they have to put themselves out to the point their parents did or their grandparents did.

I look at the people that settled the part of the country that I live in. Those ancestors in about 1875 came out there and stuck a stake in the ground out in the prairie and claimed a homestead of 160 acres. And a lot of them came out in covered wagons. And if they had a good day traveling, they would walk behind the oxen 10 miles a day on a good day. Some days they didn't move at all because it was muddy, they were bogged down, something went wrong, they broke an axle or wheel or whatever it was. Ten miles a day on a good day to get out on the prairie to drive a stake in the ground and say, This is my 160 acres, and if I build a home on it and I take care of it and I farm it and make it productive—under the Homestead Act they could keep it. That's the American dream.

They went out there to live free or die out there on that prairie, and they had to raise their food and they had to protect themselves from the elements and from hostiles. And that independent spirit is the thread of the Americans that we are today.

We didn't ever think about capitulating. We didn't think about giving up. We never thought the winters were too tough or the days too long or the work was too hard or too hot or too sweaty or too dusty or snowy or rainy. We did what we had to do because we were driven to succeed, we were driven to achieve the American dream. And by the way, there wasn't a fallback position. That fallback position would have been freeze to death, starve to death, let the hostiles take over you. Any number of things could happen.

Well, that American spirit is what has brought about the thriving of the

American people and our tenacity globally. If you look at where we are economically, American business has gone around the globe. We set the standard. We set the pace in patents and in trademarks and creativity and in productivity. We set the pace from a military-security standpoint. We set the pace from a cultural standpoint. We set the pace from a religious standpoint.

All of these things that I am talking about here are undermined by people on this side of the aisle and undermined by a socialized medicine bill that the Senate could not pass today, the House would not approve of, that diminishes us and expands our dependency so that it can expand the political class that supports and votes for them.

This is a cynical political move, and if it was about policy, Madam Speaker, then one of them, just one of them—and I have a question I want to project to the gentleman from Texas here in a moment—but if it was about policy, then the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, HARRY REID of the Senate, or someone out of all of these Democrats over here would have pointed to a country in the world that has a better health care system than the United States and said, Let's emulate that.

□ 2210

Well, whom shall we emulate? China? Russia? Cuba? Canada? Great Britain? Germany? I think all of us would reject all of those proposals. If there is a country out there that does it better, I would like to know, and we will take a look at that. I pose that question as more than a rhetorical question, but a real question of substance that has been unanswered. And I would yield to the gentleman from Texas wherever he would like to take that.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I certainly appreciate the question, because we just happen to have a chart here. And this is a chart, as it says, government-run care means lower survival rates for cancer. Now, we have been told by friends across the aisle, well, but if you look at England or you look at other countries, you find that they have a longer life expectancy than we do in America. Well, not if you're looking at cancer survival rates. If you compare apples to apples, you find out, as my friend from Iowa said, there is no better health care anywhere in the world when you want a good, the best survival rate, whether it's cancer, heart disease or whatever.

Now, the place where the statistics get skewed is our life expectancy in the United States has added in and this is terribly unfortunate, a higher murder rate than some of those countries have. And one other thing that really skews the figures in the United States is that when a baby is born, it doesn't matter if that baby is 20 weeks premature, 10 weeks, 8 to 10 weeks, like my wife's and my first child, if that child is born alive and subsequently dies, even if it's

an hour later, that counts in our statistics because in America the majority still feels that every life counts.

Well, in many of the countries that they try to compare us with with our life expectancy, if a baby is born prematurely and dies, they don't count that. We count it here. And when you have a child that dies within an hour or 2 hours, it dramatically brings down the life expectancy. But it's one of the things I love about America. We care about lives here in America. And so you look at this chart, if you could choose a country to go to if you got cancer, well, you could go, this green here is England, but that is not the greatest survival rate.

My goodness, look at prostate cancer, 50.9 percent survival rate. That's not so good. In the United States, we have a 91.9 percent. That is phenomenal, up 41 percent. That means in the United States, if you get prostate cancer, for every two people that get prostate cancer in the United States, most of the time, both of them are going to live. However in England, you have two people that get prostate cancer, one of them will die. And it's so unnecessary because they have access to the same types of health care we do.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Just as I look at the statistics here, and I see the 91 percent of survival rate of prostate cancer in America, that means out of 10 patients, nine will live. I look at the ratio in the United Kingdom, 50 percent. That means out of two patients, one of them will die. One out of 10 will die in America, one out of two will die in England. That is the comparison in the results of this health care.

Mr. GOHMERT. Why would you want to go to any other country? So who could blame the Newfoundland prime minister when he had a heart problem, for saying, I love you, Canada, you're my country, I love you and I am totally devoted, but I am flying to the United States for my heart surgery, which he did. He is a smart man, obviously.

But you look at breast cancer, and I've been shown statistics that are not on here. For example, in breast cancer, if a tumor is found localized in a breast, then we have a 98 percent survival rate, 98 percent survival rate, if a cancerous tumor is found localized in the breast. In England, it's about 20 percent less than that. In other words, even though both countries have wonderful technology, when you have a government-run program, you have to put people on lists.

And the President is right. He is not being disingenuous when he says we are not going to deny coverage. For the most part, that is right. What you do is you put them on lists so that they die before they get what they need. And I was talking to a really sweet secretary in Tyler, Texas, my hometown, and she has emigrated from England. And she told me that her mother got cancer in England and died of that cancer because she was in England. Each step of

the way, finding the tumor, having surgery, having therapy, all the things that you have, chemo, all those things, you get on a list. She said, my mother was found to have cancer, and she died because she lived in England. After I emigrated to the United States, I was found to have cancer, and she said I'm alive because I was in the United States instead of England. She said, because I didn't go on a list.

And this is not some wealthy person. This is a middle class secretary with a lot of class. And she knows just how good we have it here. And so you've got all men's cancer: 66.3 percent survival rate here; in England, 44.8 percent; 53 percent in Canada. That's a lot of people. We heard our friend from Florida come down and rant and rave about people and you're killing folks in our district. But all I can see when I look at these cancer survival rates and death rates is when you want us to go to a government-run health care—I know it's not intentional, I know it's not intentional—but the fact is you will cause people to die unnecessarily.

There is no reason to have this kind of drop in prostate cancer success, but that's what we have. And it's so unnecessary.

You've got all women's cancer, 62.9; 55.8 in England. There's not quite as big a discrepancy, but if you're one of the 9 percent or 7 percent in these different categories or even 41 percent that are going to die because you don't live in the United States, then you probably think the United States is the place to be for health care. You take out the murder statistics and you make all countries deal with their statistics of premature babies who die after they're born, then you would find the United States at the top of the charts on life expectancy.

So I appreciate the gentleman yielding on that particular issue.

□ 2220

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and so we have seen what the data is on survival rates for cancer in the United States versus Canada and Great Britain and one other country.

There is another point that has been made, I say it has been made consistently by the President of the United States, it has been made by the Speaker of the House, and that is this point that there is nothing in any bill that is likely to pass the House or the Senate that could become law that doesn't fund abortion or illegals. This is where the argument came in. Madam Speaker, it is a JOE WILSON argument.

Well, I will deal first with the issue of illegals. The House version of the bill is looser than the Senate version of the bill. But when the President says we are not going to fund illegals, he is not right on that. The Senate version is a little tighter. But if you go to the language in the Senate bill, it says essentially that it lowers the standards.

We had a standard that existed under the Medicaid standards, which is pretty

close to the gold standard as far as the Federal Government is concerned, that if an individual were going to sign up for Medicaid, that they would have to prove their citizenship by providing a birth certificate and a couple of supporting documents or a series of naturalization papers that would allow people to sign up and receive Medicaid benefits.

But when this House, under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, changed the language under SCHIP, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, which I called socialized Clinton-style HillaryCare for illegals and their parents, when they changed that, they lowered the standard, and the standard then for Medicaid and the standard for SCHIP became the same, and that is the standard that exists in the Senate language of the bill. Even though it says we are not going to fund illegals, the proof is simply a requirement that they introduce and offer, let me say, attest to a nine-digit Social Security number.

Well, if you have people that are adept at gaming the system, they are not likely to be so intimidated that they would not be able to produce a nine-digit Social Security number. It is unlikely that it will be checked. The standards to require that are a little tighter in the Senate version than they are in the House version, but the Congressional Budget Office, when one examines their calculations, it produces this number:

Under the Senate language, 6.1 million illegals could access health care benefits, health insurance benefits under the Senate version of the bill which presumably, if you listen to the Speaker of the House, the House is ready to pass. 6.1 million illegals. And yet, the Speaker and the President say we are not going to fund illegals because they say in the bill they are not going to fund illegals. But you have to look at the standards.

This is akin to the no earmarks edict that was delivered to this House at the beginning of the 110th Congress the first year of the Pelosi Speakership when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, DAVID OBEY, brought a big appropriations bill to the floor. And when he was challenged for all the earmarks that were in it, even though they had pledged they were not going to provide earmarks—this is the Pelosi Speakership—DAVID OBEY said, There are not earmarks in this bill. But when pointed out to him that there were hundreds of earmarks in the bill, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee then went to the first page of the bill, I believe it was the second paragraph, and he read verbatim from the bill—generally speaking, not verbatim from me—is this: There are no earmarks in the bill by definition; therefore, this bill doesn't have earmarks.

Can you actually write stuff out, the things that we can't believe our lying

eyes because someone has said by definition it doesn't exist? That is what is going on here.

They will argue by definition they don't want to fund illegals, but the result is 6.1 million illegals taking advantage of the Senate version of the bill by the calculations of the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office. The House version funds illegals. The Senate version funds illegals. And the House version, I know a little better, it funds them in a myriad of ways.

Also, the Senate version funds abortion with American people's tax dollars. That is something also that the President says they are not doing. That is something that the Speaker of the House says they are not doing. And I haven't actually heard Majority Leader HARRY REID say one way or the other.

But there are a couple of ways that this happens. One of them is in this chart right here. And so, Madam Speaker, it goes like this:

When you have Americans that have to fund into these three different systems, pay taxes, or enroll in an exchange plan, or enroll in an exchange plan that covers abortions, some of them will be enrolled in an exchange plan that covers abortions unintentionally because their employer will offer that. And they will sign up and they won't ask the question, and they won't know that their premium is going to fund abortion. But in any case, they will enroll in the red version here that funds abortions.

Mr. GOHMERT. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. If you look at page 122, the exact point is made that you are making. It says that there is at least one such health care plan that provides coverage of services described in clauses i and ii of subparagraph (b).

You look at subparagraph (b)(i), and it says: The services described in this clause are abortions for which the expenditure of Federal funds appropriated for the Department of Health and Human Services is not permitted based on the laws in effect at the date that is six months before the beginning of the plan year.

So this has actually misled people into thinking, oh, there is a provision here that prevents you from using money—

I am sorry. We were told we had 6 minutes, and we have used 4. Okay.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In that case, I take the gentleman's point and I think it has been driven home effectively by this chart and the language that we know.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence. And if I called you Madam Speaker, I apologize. I didn't have a rearview mirror. And I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness caused by food poisoning.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARAMENDI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZZO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 23.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 23.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today and March 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 23.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GARAMENDI, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution recognizing and congratulating the City of Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the new official site of the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Service and the National Emergency Medical Service Memorial; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on March 15, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3433. To amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to establish requirements regarding payment of the non-Federal share of the costs of wetlands conservation projects in Canada that are funded under that Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6611. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Honey Packers and Importers Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order and Suspension of Assessments Under the Honey Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Order [Docket No.: AMS-FV-06-0176; FV-03-704-FR] (RIN: 0581-AC37) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6612. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0063; FV09-966-2 FIR] received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6613. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendments to Rules Requiring Internet Availability of Proxy Materials [Release Nos.: 33-9108; 34-61560; IC-29131; File No. S7-22-09] (RIN: 3235-AK25) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6614. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Magnet Schools Assistance Program [Docket ID: ED-2010-OII-0003] (RIN: 1855-AA07) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6615. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Investing in Innovation Fund [Docket ID: ED-2009-OII-0012] (RIN: 1855-AA06) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6616. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for 48 Species on Kauai and Designation of Critical Habitat [FWS-R1-ES-2008-0046] (RIN: 1018-AV48) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6617. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Oregon Chub (*Oregonichthys crameri*) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2009-0010] (RIN: 1018-AV87) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6618. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulations — Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains (RIN: 1024-AD68) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6619. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Designation of Critical Habitat for the California Red-Legged Frog

[FWS-R8-ES-2009-0089] (RIN: 1018-AV90) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6620. A letter from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties; Adjustments [Docket No.: 0612213340-6339-01] (RIN: 0690-AA35) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6621. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A380-841, -842, and -861 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0038; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-16203; AD 2010-04-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6622. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 Series Airplanes and Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1107; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-138-AD; Amendment 39-16202; AD 2010-04-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6623. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Augustair, Inc. Models 2150, 2150A, and 2180 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0121; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-16207; AD 2010-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6624. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Extra Flugzeugproduktions-und Vertriebs-GmbH Models EA-300/200 and EA-300/L Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1025 Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-055-AD; Amendment 39-16204; AD 2010-04-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6625. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McCauley Propeller Systems 1A103/TCM Series Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0093; Directorate Identifier 97-ANE-06-AD; Amendment 39-16198; AD 2010-04-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6626. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SCHEIBE-Flugzeugbau GmbH Model SF 25C Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0125; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-005-AD; Amendment 39-16208; AD 2010-04-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6627. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Thielert Aircraft Engines GmbH (TAE) Model TAE 125-01 Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0747; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-28-AD; Amendment 39-16199; AD 2010-04-06] (RIN:

2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6628. A letter from the Senior Regulation Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs [Docket No.: OST-2007-26828] (RIN: 2105-AD64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6629. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, & 702), CL-600-2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705), and CL-600-2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1027; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-143-AD; Amendment 39-16197; AD 2010-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6630. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2010-14) received March 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, extend the Build America Bonds program, provide other infrastructure job creation tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 4850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow companies to utilize existing alternative minimum tax credits to create and maintain United States jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 4851. A bill to provide a temporary extension of certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENAUER,

Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SABLON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 4852. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to establish a grant program to improve the ability of trauma center hospitals and airports to withstand earthquakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 4854. A bill to require that any home inspection conducted in connection with a purchase of residential real property that involves a federally related mortgage loan be conducted by a State-licensed or State-certified home inspector to determine the existence of structural, mechanical, and electrical safety defects, and to require inclusion in the standard HUD-1 settlement statement of information regarding any home inspection conducted in connection with settlement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 4855. A bill to establish the Work-Life Balance Award for employers that have developed and implemented work-life balance policies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOYD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. HILL, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 4856. A bill to require the President's budget and the congressional budget to disclose and display the net present value of future costs of entitlement programs; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HODES:

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow amounts to be transferred from a qualified tuition program to the Thrift Savings Plan for the benefit of any individual who is eligible to participate in such Plan by virtue of being a member of the uniformed services or of the Ready Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on

Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4858. A bill to establish an advisory committee to issue nonbinding government-wide guidelines on making public information available on the Internet, to require publicly available Government information held by the executive branch to be made available on the Internet, to express the sense of Congress that publicly available information held by the legislative and judicial branches should be available on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small business which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4860. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to provide electric consumers the right to access certain electric energy information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BEAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HARE, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 4861. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1343 West Irving Park Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Steve Goodman Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 4862. A bill to permit Members of Congress to administer the oath of allegiance to applicants for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESTAK (for himself and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4863. A bill to increase the annual amount authorized for emergency assistance under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 4864. A bill to require a heightened review process by the Secretary of Labor of State occupational safety and health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 81. A joint resolution recognizing Madam C.J. Walker for her achievements as a trailblazing woman in business, philanthropist, and 20th century activist for social

justice; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HODES:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution recognizing Doris "Granny D" Haddock, who inspired millions of people through remarkable acts of political activism, and extending the condolences of Congress on the death of Doris "Granny D" Haddock; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 1184. A resolution congratulating the 2009-2010 University of Maryland Men's Basketball Team, Greivis Vasquez, and Coach Gary Williams on an outstanding season; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Res. 1185. A resolution congratulating Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin on his tenth year of service as Chaplain of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado:

H. Res. 1186. A resolution expressing support for designation of April as National Distracted Driving Awareness Month; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H. Res. 1187. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to raising public awareness of and helping to prevent attacks against Federal employees while engaged in or on account of the performance of official duties; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 43: Mr. COHEN and Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 211: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 413: Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 616: Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 618: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 690: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 847: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 948: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 988: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1077: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1189: Mr. OLVER and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1207: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1210: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1240: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 1314: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1507: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1520: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1521: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1526: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1584: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1625: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1806: Mr. BILBRAY and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1826: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 1879: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1894: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. DRIEHAUS, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2021: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 2122: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2142: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2262: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2308: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2413: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2443: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2483: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 2565: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2598: Mr. KISSELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. KIND, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NYE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2656: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 2672: Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H.R. 2733: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MINNICK.

H.R. 2766: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2819: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2999: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 3024: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3101: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 3277: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3287: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3315: Ms. KILROY.

H.R. 3321: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. KILROY, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 3351: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3415: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STARK, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 3554: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3578: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 3608: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 3652: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3668: Mr. INGLIS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 3705: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3715: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3745: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3752: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 3964: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 4014: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 4021: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 4068: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 4091: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4109: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4132: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 4148: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KILROY, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 4149: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4155: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 4278: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 4364: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 4376: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 4402: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. WU.

H.R. 4415: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 4497: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 4530: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4531: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4539: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 4541: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4558: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4572: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 4603: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 4615: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4616: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4638: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4645: Mr. WALZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4647: Mr. PETERS, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 4678: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4694: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 4709: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4717: Mr. NUNES, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4722: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4732: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 4755: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 4766: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 4772: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4789: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CHU, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 4790: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILROY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 4809: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4812: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. STARK, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4813: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 4825: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4833: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 4842: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4846: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. FALCOMA-VAEGA.
H.J. Res. 42: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, and Mr. FLAKE.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H. Con. Res. 49: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. FORBES.
H. Con. Res. 201: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Ms. JENKINS.
H. Con. Res. 230: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Con. Res. 244: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. FLEMING.
H. Con. Res. 245: Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 111: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 213: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 236: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 605: Mr. PENCE.
H. Res. 704: Mr. AKIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. CAMP.
H. Res. 1016: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. CLEAVER.
H. Res. 1026: Mr. MICA.

H. Res. 1033: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. TURNER.
H. Res. 1053: Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 1075: Mr. TERRY and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H. Res. 1099: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 1104: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 1119: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 1128: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H. Res. 1158: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 1161: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. OBEY.
H. Res. 1167: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 1171: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. KILROY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 1174: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Res. 1180: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 1181: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. PENCE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1255: Mr. SARBANES.